

1
2 **FILED & ENTERED**
3
4
5
6

NOV 01 2019

CLERK U.S. BANKRUPTCY COURT
Central District of California
BY bakchell DEPUTY CLERK

7 **NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

8 **UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT**

9 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **LOS ANGELES DIVISION**

11 In re:

12 PETER G. KUDRAVE,

13 Debtor.

14 Case No. 2:17-bk-17577-RK

15 Chapter 11

16 **MEMORANDUM DECISION ON FINAL
FEE APPLICATION OF LAW OFFICES
OF DAVID A. TILEM, FORMER
COUNSEL FOR DEBTOR IN
POSSESSION**

17
18 Pending before the court is the Application for Final Fees and Expenses for Law
19 Offices of David A. Tilem (“LODAT”), former bankruptcy counsel¹ for Debtor in Possession
20 Peter G. Kudrave, filed on August 3, 2018, Electronic Case Filing Number (“ECF”) 98,
21 amended on September 28, 2018, ECF 112, and supplemented on April 22, 2019, ECF
22 138 (collectively referred hereto as the “Fee Application”). The Fee Application is a
23 contested matter within the meaning of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014
24 because the Debtor in Possession and now Reorganized Debtor, Peter G. Kudrave
25 (“Debtor”), filed declarations in opposition to the Fee Application. ECF 108, 115, 124, 125.

26
27 ¹ The court granted the Motion of Law Offices of David A. Tilem to Withdraw as Attorney on August 2,
28 2018, effective upon the entry of an Order confirming Debtor’s First Amended Plan of Reorganization. ECF
No. 97. The court also confirmed Debtor’s First Amended Plan of Reorganization by order entered on August
2, 2018. ECF 96.

1 After LODAT filed its original final fee application on August 3, 2018, Debtor filed a
2 declaration in opposition to the Fee Application on August 15, 2018. ECF 108. By order
3 filed and entered on August 24, 2018, the court continued the hearing noticed for the
4 original Fee Application, for August 28, 2018, to October 24, 2018 because notice of the
5 Fee Application was insufficient as not all of the creditors were properly served as required
6 by Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure 2002(a)(6) and 9013. The court also accorded
7 some latitude to Debtor as a self-represented party by allowing additional time for him to
8 state his specific reasons for his opposition in writing. ECF 109.

9 On September 28, 2018, LODAT filed its amended Fee Application and noticed the
10 amended application for hearing on the continued hearing date of October 24, 2018. ECF
11 112. On October 22, 2018, Debtor filed a motion for continuance of the hearing on the Fee
12 Application for medical reasons on grounds that he was “physically and mentally unable to
13 appear or testify” in opposition to the application on October 24, 2018 because he had “a
14 massive, double bypass heart surgery performed [on] September 13, 2018.” ECF 117. By
15 order filed and entered on October 22, 2019, the court continued the hearing on the Fee
16 Application to December 5, 2019. ECF 118. On December 3, 2018, the court on its own
17 motion continued the hearing on December 5, 2018 to December 12, 2018 because the
18 court was not conducting hearings on December 5, 2018 to observe the National Day of
19 Mourning proclaimed by President Trump in honor of former President George H.W. Bush.
20 At the hearing on December 12, 2018, the court set the contested matter of the Fee
21 Application for a one-day trial on January 30, 2019.

22 On January 30, 2019, the court conducted a trial on the contested matter of the Fee
23 Application as then amended. Appearances at trial were made by LODAT, by its principal,
24 David A. Tilem, and Debtor for himself, and Mr. Tilem and Debtor testified. Because
25 Debtor filed an amended declaration on the day before trial, ECF 124 and 125, the court
26 set a briefing schedule whereby LODAT was given the opportunity until February 25, 2019
27 to respond to the amended declaration, and Debtor was given until March 11, 2019, to
28

1 reply to the response of LODAT. On February 25, 2019, LODAT filed its reply to Debtor's
2 amended declaration. ECF 127.

3 On February 26, 2019, the court entered an order assigning the contested matter of
4 the Fee Application and a related adversary proceeding to mediation. ECF 128. The
5 parties participated in mediation on March 21, 2019, wherein they reached an agreement
6 in principle resolving all disputes between them, including the Fee Application, and they
7 orally stated the agreement on the record in open court on March 21, 2019, and the court
8 orally indicated that it would approve the agreement. Audio Recording of Hearing, March
9 21, 2019.

10 On April 2, 2019, the court filed and entered an order setting the proposed order
11 submitted by LODAT for hearing on approval of the settlement because the proposed
12 settlement approval order requested approval of LODAT's fees and costs in the amount of
13 \$70,000.00, which was greater than the amount of fees and costs requested by LODAT in
14 the Fee Application at the time. ECF 132. In its order, the court requested that LODAT
15 submit a supplemental billing statement that would provide a factual basis for the amount
16 of fees in excess of the amount included in the Fee Application as then filed. *Id.* In the
17 order, the court indicated that it realized that there was an insufficient factual basis for the
18 court to formally approve the settlement because it had to carry out its independent duty to
19 review professional fees for reasonableness under 11 U.S.C. § 330 and had to review the
20 additional fees that had been requested in the settlement, but not yet reviewed. The court
21 also noted that Debtor indicated that he still wanted approval of the proposed settlement at
22 the case status conference on March 27, 2019. *Id.* On April 17, 2019, the court conducted
23 a hearing on the order lodged by LODAT attempting to resolve the contested matter of the
24 Fee Application as a result of the settlement, and at this hearing, both LODAT and Debtor
25 appeared and stated that they were no longer willing to agree to the settlement terms
26 reached in mediation.

27 On April 22, 2019, LODAT filed its Supplemental Fee Application, which requested
28 additional fees as well as the fees previously requested in the original and amended fee

1 applications, and noticed the Supplemental Fee Application for hearing on May 28, 2019.
2 ECF 138. The additional fees in the Supplemental Fee Application covered the additional
3 period of February 24, 2019 through April 19, 2019, which included time spent by LODAT
4 for defending the Fee Application. *Id.*

5 On May 22, 2019, the court filed and entered its Order Requiring the Parties to
6 Lodge Electronic Spreadsheets of Disputed Billing Entries and Continuing Hearing on Fee
7 Application, which required the parties to submit the billing entries on the Fee Application
8 and objections thereto on computer files in Microsoft Excel spreadsheet format in order for
9 the court to review in detail and rule upon the Fee Application. ECF 141. This order
10 further provided that the hearing on the Fee Application as supplemented was continued to
11 August 29, 2019. *Id.*

12 LODAT submitted a computer file with its billing entries for the Fee Application in
13 Microsoft Excel spreadsheet format by the deadline of June 26, 2019.² Debtor did not
14 submit to the court a computer file with his objections to the billing entries on the Fee
15 Application in Microsoft Excel spreadsheet format by the deadline of July 31, 2019. At a
16 hearing in this case, Debtor explained that he did not know how to use Microsoft Excel.

17 On May 23, 2019, Debtor filed a document entitled Complaint to Vacate Order
18 Granting Counsel Motion to Withdraw as Procured Through: (A) Negligent
19 Misrepresentation, (B) Constructive Fraud and (C) Breach of Attorney-Client Relationship;
20 and Motion in Opposition for Application of Payment of Additional Fees. ECF 142.

21 On July 23, 2019, Debtor filed a Motion to Vacate Order granting Counsel
22 Withdrawal of Representation; Motion in Opposition to Application for Payment of
23 Compensation including Request for Additional Supplemental Fees; Monetary Damages;
24 Relief of Loss of Income. ECF 152. Accordingly, Debtor expressly objected on the record

25 _____
26 ² The court's rulings are based on LODAT's final fee spreadsheet, which was delivered to the court by
27 electronic mail on June 25, 2019. Because LODAT's final fee spreadsheet was not previously placed on the
28 record, the court is having it placed on the record by filing a printed copy with a declaration by a court staff
member. Although LODAT's Supplemental Fee Application, ECF 138, includes a table that reflects total fees
and expenses for the full case of \$89,915.34, all of the court's determinations in this memorandum decision
are based upon the spreadsheets delivered to the court on June 25, 2019, which indicate total fees and
expenses of \$82,488.55.

1 to LODAT's Fee Application in its original, amended, and supplemented forms, setting forth
2 his objections to specific billing entries in the Fee Application as amended and
3 supplemented. See ECF 115 (filed October 11, 2018); ECF 124 (filed January 29, 2019);
4 ECF 142 (filed May 23, 2019); ECF 152 (filed July 23, 2019). Apparently, the July 23,
5 2019, pleading filed by Debtor, ECF 152, was in response to the court's May 22, 2019
6 order that the parties submit to the court their billing entries and their objections therein on
7 a computer file in Microsoft Excel spreadsheet format. In light of Debtor's self-represented
8 status and lack of facility with Microsoft Excel, the court considers his objections to
9 LODAT's billing entries and sets forth its rulings on the billing entries and objections thereto
10 on the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet submitted by LODAT. It appears to the court that
11 Debtor met the deadline of July 31, 2019 as to stating his objections to specific billing
12 entries of LODAT the best that he could.

13 At the hearing on the Fee Application on August 28, 2019, LODAT appeared, and
14 an attorney representing the family of Debtor appeared, stating that Debtor had passed
15 away on August 15, 2019 and requesting a 60-day continuance of the hearing pending the
16 appointment of a representative of Debtor's probate estate who would respond to the Fee
17 Application and determine whether to proceed with the bankruptcy case in lieu of Debtor.
18 Over the objection of LODAT, the court on its own motion continued the hearing to October
19 23, 2019 at the request of the family of Debtor based on the representation that time was
20 needed for the appointment of a probate estate representative to respond to the Fee
21 Application and to determine whether to proceed with the bankruptcy case. On October 9,
22 2019, counsel for the Proposed Estate of Decedent Debtor Peter Kudrave filed a formal
23 suggestion of the death of Debtor upon the record, stating that Debtor passed away on
24 August 15, 2019. ECF 156 (attaching Death Certificate of Peter G. Kudrave). However,
25 since no further written response from a representative of Debtor's proposed probate
26 estate in lieu of Debtor was filed on the Fee Application, the court filed and entered an
27 order on October 21, 2019, taking the Fee Application and objections thereto under
28 submission.

1 Having considered the Fee Application (which includes the Amended and
2 Supplemental Fee Applications), the objections thereto, the other pleadings and papers
3 filed by the parties, the witness testimony, the exhibits received at trial, and the record
4 before the court, the court hereby makes the following findings of fact and conclusions of
5 law pursuant to Rule 52 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, made applicable here by
6 Rules 7052 and 9014(c) of the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure, in support of its
7 ruling to approve in part and disapprove in part the Fee Application.

8 **I. BACKGROUND**

9 **A. Debtor's Petition**

10 On June 21, 2017, Debtor commenced this bankruptcy case by filing a voluntary
11 petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code, 11 U.S.C., Case No. 2:17-bk-
12 17577-RK, ECF 1. Debtor was assisted by LODAT as proposed general bankruptcy
13 counsel in preparing his bankruptcy petition and schedules.

14 **B. Major Events in Debtor's Bankruptcy Case**

15 On July 21, 2017, Debtor's case status report, prepared by LODAT, was filed in
16 preparation for the initial status conference in the case, scheduled for August 9, 2017.
17 ECF 24. In the initial status report, Debtor stated that he was a licensed architect for just
18 under 50 years and that at this stage of his career, his business was almost exclusively
19 providing expert witness services in malpractice, construction defect and similar cases. *Id.*
20 at 1. The status report stated that "the estate [had] only one significant asset – Debtor's
21 residence which he designed and built for his family in the 1970s" and that "[t]he residence
22 is occupied by Debtor and his severely debilitated wife." *Id.* The status report explained
23 what precipitated the bankruptcy case: "Debtor's business experienced a bad year in 2016.
24 He fell behind in mortgage payments and a foreclosure sale was imminent." *Id.* at 2. In
25 explaining his goals for the bankruptcy case, Debtor stated: "Debtor hopes to clean up title
26 to his home, cure the default on his mortgage and pay the junior liens, most likely through
27 a 5 year Chapter 13 style plan." *Id.* The status report also identified the anticipated
28 problems in the case: "Debtor anticipates a relief from stay motion. Debtor is prepared to

1 negotiate an adequate protection stipulation and plan treatment as soon as lender's
2 counsel is identified." *Id.* In stating the means of resolution of the case, Debtor stated:
3 "The problems will be resolved either through negotiation or a Chapter 13 style cure plan."
4 *Id.*

5 On June 29, 2017, Debtor filed a motion to employ LODAT as general bankruptcy
6 counsel. ECF 13. On July 12, 2017, Debtor filed a motion to employ Real Works, Inc. as
7 appraiser to appraise Debtor's real property, the residence (the "Real Property"). ECF 21.
8 The court granted Debtor's motion to employ LODAT by order entered July 25, 2017, ECF
9 25, and the motion to employ Real Works, Inc. by order entered August 8, 2017, ECF 32.
10 The court set a deadline of October 16, 2017, for creditors to file proofs of claim against
11 Debtor's estate. ECF 34.

12 On October 2, 2017, Debtor filed a Case Status Conference Report indicating,
13 among others, that the Real Property was in serious need of a new roof. ECF 40 at 2. On
14 October 23, 2017, Debtor filed a Motion for Order Authorizing Use of Property of the Estate
15 Not in the Ordinary Course of Business, proposing to replace the roof on the Real Property
16 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 363(b). ECF 41. The court granted this motion by order entered
17 on December 4, 2017. ECF 51.

18 Debtor also filed a Motion to Disallow the Claim of Olmax Corp. on November 11,
19 2017. ECF 46. No opposition to the Motion to Disallow the Claim of Olmax Corp. was
20 filed, and the court granted Debtor's motion by order entered December 28, 2017. ECF
21 55.

22 On January 16, 2018, Debtor filed a motion to employ Zivetz, Schwartz & Saltsman
23 as accountant for assistance with tax matters. ECF 58. The court granted Debtor's motion
24 to employ Zivetz, Schwartz & Saltsman by order entered February 9, 2018. ECF 66.

25 On January 31, 2018, Debtor filed: (i) a Notice of Motion and Motion for Order
26 Approving Disclosure Statement, ECF 62, (ii) a Form F2081-1.DISCLSR.STMT, Individual
27 Debtor's Disclosure Statement in Support of Plan Reorganization ("Form Disclosure
28 Statement"), ECF 60, and (iii) a Form F 2081-1.PLAN, Individual Debtor's Plan of

1 Reorganization (“Form Plan”), ECF 61. The Forms F 2081-1.DISCLSR.STMT and F 2081-
2 1.PLAN are official forms approved by the court, which contain boilerplate language for
3 terms of a Chapter 11 reorganization plan and a disclosure statement. The Form
4 Disclosure Statement and Form Plan include “fill in the blank” provisions for plan duration
5 and payments, making it easier and more cost-efficient for individual Chapter 11 debtors
6 and their counsel to file a Chapter 11 reorganization plan and disclosure statement without
7 having to draft plan and disclosure statement language from scratch. The Form Disclosure
8 Statement and Form Plan can be customized by drafting attachments. Here, LODAT
9 drafted attachments for Debtor’s plan and disclosure statement. The plan and disclosure
10 statement attachments are major areas of dispute, however, between the parties.

11 Debtor’s disclosure statement and plan were straightforward exercises for an
12 experienced bankruptcy practitioner. With respect to plan treatment of the first lien lender
13 on Debtor’s Real Property, Wells Fargo Bank N.A., the plan proposed to reamortize the
14 existing loan over 40 years and to pay the secured claim of \$1.4 million at 4% interest per
15 annum, \$6,426 per month, and if Debtor and the bank were unable to agree on these
16 terms, the plan would have to be significantly modified. ECF 60 and 61. The
17 memorandum of points and authorities in support of the Motion for Order Approving
18 Disclosure Statement consisted of one and one-half pages of text as follows in its entirety:

19 Peter G. Kudrave is the Debtor (“Debtor”) in the above-captioned case. This
20 case was commenced by filing a voluntary chapter 11 petition on June 21, 2017.
No trustee has been appointed and Debtors are still Debtors-in-Possession.

21 Bankruptcy Code Section 1125 requires Chapter 11 debtors to prepare and
22 provide a Disclosure Statement to those entitled to vote on any proposed Chapter
11 plan. The Disclosure Statement must have sufficient information to enable
23 creditors to cast an informed vote on the proposed plan.

24 ***The instant case is straightforward and not much disclosure is required
for comprehension of the plan.*** Debtor is an individual who resides in the Central
25 District of California. The Debtor filed this bankruptcy in order to prevent foreclosure
on his residence. The Debtor will fund his reorganization using cash from of Social
26 Security and income as a self-employed architectural consultant and expert witness.

27 Debtor maintains that his Disclosure Statement provides adequate evidence
28 of funds sufficient to pay Debtor’s creditors per the proposed treatment in the Plan
and Disclosure Statement, described [in] the liquidation analysis to show that

1 creditors are being paid at least what they would receive if the Debtor liquidated his
2 assets.

3 Based on the foregoing, Debtor prays that:

4

- 5 1. The Court find the Disclosure Statement provides adequate information
6 regarding the Debtor, his financial affairs, and the proposed Plan of
7 Reorganization.
- 8 2. The Court approve the Disclosure Statement and schedule dates to advance the
9 process of confirming Debtor's proposed Plan of Reorganization.

10 *Notice of Motion and Motion for Order Approving Disclosure Statement*, ECF 62 at 3-4
11 (emphasis added).

12 As previously noted, the disclosure statement was prepared on the official court
13 Form Disclosure Statement.³ The attachments to the disclosure statement included three
14 "inserts" which were special disclosure statement provisions: Insert #1 consisted of
15 instructions for voting on the plan; Insert #2 consisted of a schedule of monthly household
16 income from January 2013 through December 2017 based on figures provided by Debtor,
17 including bank deposits and social security income; and Insert #3 contained additional plan
18 provisions regarding claims objections and attorney fees, which provided that the Debtor
19 reserved the right to object to certain claims⁴ and that attorney fees would be due and
20 payable the later of 10 days after the plan effective date or 14 days after entry of the
21 court's order approving the fees. *Id.* at 10.

22 The attachments to the disclosure statement also included: Exhibit A, a Form 3015-
23 1.20.DEC.INCOME.EXPENSE, Declaration of Current/Postpetition Income and Expenses,
24 showing business income, social security income, and updated monthly expenses; Exhibit

25 ³ The blanks in the Form Disclosure Statement were completed to state that general unsecured
26 creditors would be paid 100% of their allowed claims without interest in 47 months, that \$39,200 in cash
27 would be available on the plan effective date, that monthly disposable income of \$1,042.00, based on
monthly income of \$18,418.00 and monthly expenses of \$17,317.00 as of January 31, 2018, would be
available to make plan payments over the 4 year term of the plan, that plan risk factors included Debtor's
health, the possibility of another "bad year," inability to reach agreement with Debtor's home lender and "bad
estimation" of Debtor's tax obligations for 2018 and thereafter. *Debtor's Disclosure Statement*, ECF 60 at 2-
5. The liquidation analysis in the disclosure statement indicated that general unsecured creditors would
receive a 100% of their claims in a liquidation of Debtor and the feasibility analysis showed cash on hand of
\$14,127.71 and projected additional accumulated cash of \$25,072.29 as of the effective date. *Id.* at 5-6.

28 ⁴ Insert #3 provided that Debtor was not reserving the right to object to the claims filed or held by
Gregory Creighton (scheduled), Robert Oltman (filed on October 13, 2017), Nordstrom (scheduled) and Wells
Fargo Bank (filed on August 16, 2017). *Id.* at 10.

1 B, Bankruptcy Schedules A/B, ECF 19; Exhibit C, Claims Schedule, listing the claims
2 organized by class and whether they were disputed; Exhibit D, a plan ballot; Exhibit E,
3 Schedule of Leases and Executory Contracts, consisting of a statement that there are
4 none; and Exhibit F, Debtor's Declaration regarding his personal and financial
5 circumstances, including being a self-employed consultant and expert in legal matters
6 which require architectural expertise and having to care for his wife, which necessarily
7 reduced his income.

8 Debtor's plan was prepared on the official court Form Plan.⁵ ECF 61. The
9 attachments to the plan included five "inserts" which are special plan provisions consisting
10 of two pages of text which are quoted verbatim as follows:

11 "INSERT #1 - § 507(a)(2) - Article I, Section A

12 Debtor anticipates receiving sufficient earned income both prior to plan confirmation
13 and immediately thereafter to pay anticipated legal fees. Sources of that income have
14 already been identified and consist of reasonably current (less than 90 day) receivables.
15 Funds will be transmitted, upon receipt, to Debtor's counsel and held in counsel's IOLTA
16 account pending Court approval of compensation. Amounts not needed to pay
17 professional compensation will be returned to Debtor

18 INSERT #2 - § 507(a)(8) – Article I, Section C

19 Debtor has unpaid federal and State income and self-employment taxes due for the
20 years 2015 and 2016. The IRS and CA Franchise Tax Board have filed claims for
21 \$84,509.03 and \$11,079.89 respectively. Debtor has only just prepared returns for these
22 years. The returns were filed 1/29/18. Based on those returns, Debtor believes that the
23 total amount due is approximately \$9,000 to the IRS (mostly self-employment taxes) and
24 nothing to the State of California. Debtor reserves the right to object to the claims of the
25 IRS and CA Franchise Tax Board. Whatever taxes are due, together with interest at the
26 rate of 4.67%, will be paid in monthly installments such that they will be paid in full within
27 60 months of the Petition date. They will be paid from ordinary income. Based on the
28 newly filed returns, Debtor believes that the monthly payment will be \$210/month.

23 ⁵ The blanks in the form plan were completed to state that professional fees would be paid under a
24 plan attachment, Insert #1, priority tax claims would be paid in full over time with 4.670% interest in monthly
25 payments under a plan attachment, Insert #2, Class 2(c) claim of Wells Fargo Bank, N.A., with a first lien on
26 Debtor's real property with payment arrearages of \$115,473.00 would be paid monthly payments of \$6,426 to
27 pay its secured claim of \$1,400,000 with 4% interest over 40 years, Class 2(d) claim of Robert Oltman with a
28 second lien on Debtor's real property would be paid monthly payments of \$6,426 to pay its secured claim of
\$8,112 with 3% interest over 47 months, Class 2(e) claim of Gregory Creighton will be paid under Insert #4 in
the plan attachment, Class 6(b) claims of general unsecured creditors will be paid 100% of their claims
without interest in monthly payments over 47 months under Insert #5 in the plan attachment, and that Debtor
would have the authority to settle claims of \$3,000 or less without court approval. *Id.* at 1-6. The means of
implementation for the plan would be \$39,200 in cash in hand as of the plan confirmation hearing, plus
additional cash from projected disposable income of \$1,042 per month over 47 months. *Id.* at 7.

1 In addition, Debtor has unpaid federal and State income and self-employment taxes
2 due for 2017. Debtor projects the amount due will be \$8,054. The taxes are to be paid on
3 or before April 15, 2018 using Debtor's ordinary income and funds on hand as of the
4 Effective Date.

3 In addition, Debtor's budget reserves for projected and anticipated federal and State
4 2018 income and self-employment taxes of \$1,100/month. These taxes will be due and
payable on April 15, 2019 but are accrued throughout the year.

5 INSERT #3 – Article II, Class 2(c)

6 Debtor is currently in negotiations with lender and anticipates reaching agreement to
7 include past due amounts into the principal balance of the loan. The total is unlikely to
8 exceed \$1,400,000. The amount due will then be reamortized over a 40 year repayment
9 schedule at 4% interest. The payment amount shown in the Plan of \$6,426/month
represents \$1,400,000 at 4% amortized over 40 years plus tax and insurance payments as
reflected on lender's 12/18/2017 loan statement. In the event Debtor is unable to reach
agreement with lender, the Plan will need to be significantly modified.

10 INSERT #4 – Article II, Class 2(e)

11 Debtor acknowledges a claim of \$24,000 owed to Gregory Creighton as successor
12 in interest to decedent Helen E. Creighton. Debtor further acknowledges that the claim is
13 secured by a deed of trust on Debtor's residence. Creditor did not file a Proof of Claim,
14 Debtor cannot locate the original loan documents and Debtor does not recall all of the
terms of the loan – specifically the interest rate. Accordingly, Debtor proposes to repay this
claim without interest in full over a period of 47 months. Monthly payments will be
\$511/month.

15 Secured claim of: Gregory Creighton
16 Property address: 1615 Fairmount Ave., LaCanada-Flintridge, CA 91011
17 Priority of lien: Third
18 Amount of arrearages: \$N/A
19 Total amount of allowed claim as of: 12/31/17
20 Monthly quarterly Cure Payment amount: \$
21 Monthly quarterly Regular Payment amount: \$
22 Total monthly payments: \$ 511
23 Total amount of payments (over time) to satisfy the secured claim: \$24,000
Interest rate (to compensate creditor because claim is paid over time): 0%
First payment date: Effective Date
Amount of each installment: \$ 511
Frequency of payments: Monthly
Total yearly payments: \$ 6,132
Final payment date: Effective Date plus 47 months
Monthly payments will be due on the first day of the month.

24 INSERT #5

25 The monthly plan payments will be \$83/month for 47 months. Debtor reserves the
right to object to the scheduled claim in favor of AMEX for \$1,500. If the objection is
sustained, the monthly payments will be reduced to \$51.06/month for 47 months."

26 *Debtor's Plan*, ECF 61 at 10-11.

27

28

1 On February 14, 2018, Wells Fargo Bank filed its opposition to Debtor's disclosure
2 statement and plan, which was styled as an objection to plan confirmation, ECF 68. On
3 March 12, 2018, Debtor filed a reply to the bank's opposition to the disclosure statement
4 and plan, stating that Debtor and the bank were engaged in settlement discussions and
5 requesting a continuance of the hearing on approval of the disclosure statement to resolve
6 settlement negotiations, ECF 70. The settlement negotiations between Wells Fargo Bank
7 and Debtor were successful, as on April 19, 2018,⁶ the bank and Debtor filed a stipulation
8 to a modification of the bank's secured claim, rendering the plan fully consensual. ECF
9 74.⁷

10 After the hearing on approval of the disclosure statement on April 25, 2018, the
11 court approved Debtor's disclosure statement and scheduled plan confirmation
12 proceedings by order entered April 27, 2019. ECF 76. The court set a hearing on July 11,
13 2018, to consider confirmation of the Debtor's forthcoming Amended Plan of
14 Reorganization. *Id.* On May 1, 2018, Debtor filed an Amended Chapter 11 Plan of
15 Reorganization, incorporating the terms of the stipulation with Wells Fargo Bank. ECF 78.

16 On June 22, 2018, LODAT filed a Motion to Withdraw as Attorney to Debtor-In-
17 Possession and Continue the Confirmation Hearing ("Motion to Withdraw"). ECF 85.
18 LODAT, on behalf of Debtor, filed a Confirmation Brief in Support of the Amended Plan on
19 June 29, 2018. ECF 92. On August 2, 2018, the court confirmed the Amended Plan and
20 granted the Motion of LODAT to Withdraw. ECF 96, 97. As previously discussed, on
21 August 3, 2018, LODAT filed the Fee Application giving rise to this contested matter. See
22 ECF 98 (initial fee application filed August 3, 2018); ECF 112 (amended fee application
23 filed September 28, 2018); ECF 138 (supplement to amended fee application filed April 22,
24 2019).

25
26 ⁶ The hearing on Debtor's Motion for Order Approving Disclosure Statement was set for April 25, 2018.

27 ⁷ The loan modification stipulation made between Debtor and Wells Fargo Bank provided that the
28 bank's secured claim in the amount of \$1,388,422.73 (which included recapitalization of post-petition loan
arrears and/or fees and costs) would be paid over 40 years at 4.25% interest in monthly payments of
\$6,020.48, starting on July 1, 2018. ECF 74.

II. JURISDICTION

2 The court has jurisdiction over this contested matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C.
3 § 1334(b). Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1409(a). This is a contested matter
4 within the meaning of Federal Rule of Bankruptcy Procedure 9014. This contested matter
5 is a core proceeding pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 157(b)(2)(A), (b)(2)(B), and (b)(2)(O).

III. DISCUSSION

A. Standing

Under 11 U.S.C. § 1109(b), “[a] party in interest, including the debtor, the trustee, a creditors’ committee, an equity security holders’ committee, a creditor, an equity security holder, or any indenture trustee, may raise and may appear and be heard on any issue in a case under this chapter.” Debtor has standing to object to the Fee Application.

12 Under 11 U.S.C. § 330, the court also has an independent duty to review the
13 applications of estate professionals such as LODAT, as former general bankruptcy counsel
14 for Debtor in Possession, for reasonableness. “The bankruptcy court has a duty to review
15 fee applications notwithstanding the absence of objections by the trustee, debtor, or
16 creditors.” *In re Auto Parts Club, Inc.*, 211 B.R. 29, 33 (9th Cir. BAP 1997) (citing *In re*
17 *Busy Beaver Building Centers, Inc.*, 19 F.3d 833, 841 (3d Cir. 1994)).

B. Legal Standard

i. 11 U.S.C. § 330

Under 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1), a bankruptcy court is authorized to award “reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services rendered by . . . an attorney” and any paraprofessional person employed by an attorney. The court also has the power to award a reduced fee to a professional requesting compensation under Section 330. 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(2).

25 In determining fees allowed to a professional of a bankruptcy estate, the court must
26 examine "all relevant factors, including: (A) the time spent on [the] services; (B) the rates
27 charged for [the] services; (C) whether the services were necessary to the administration
28 of, or beneficial at the time at which the service was rendered toward the completion of [the]

1 case]; (D) whether the services were performed within a reasonable amount of time
2 commensurate with the complexity, importance, and nature of the problem, issue, or task
3 addressed; (E) with respect to a professional person, whether the person is board certified
4 or otherwise has demonstrated skill and experience in the bankruptcy field; and
5 (F) whether the compensation is reasonable based on the customary compensation
6 charged by comparably skilled practitioners in [nonbankruptcy cases].” 11 U.S.C.
7 § 330(a)(3). The court also must not allow compensation for (i) unnecessary duplication of
8 services, or (ii) services that were not:

9 (I) Reasonably likely to benefit the debtor’s estate, or
10 (II) Necessary to the administration of the case.

11 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A)(ii).

12 **ii. The Lodestar Method**

13 Courts customarily apply a formula known as the ‘lodestar’ method to complement
14 these statutory factors, multiplying a reasonable number of hours expended by a
15 reasonable hourly rate to determine allowable compensation. *Unsecured Creditors’*
16 *Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc.*, 924 F.2d 955, 960 (9th Cir. 1991); *In re Manoa*
17 *Finance Co., Inc.*, 853 F.2d 687, 691 (9th Cir. 1988). In *Manoa Finance Company*, the
18 Ninth Circuit held that a compensation award based on the lodestar method is
19 “presumptively a reasonable fee.” 853 F.2d at 691. Although courts customarily begin a
20 fee determination by applying the lodestar method—the “primary” fee calculation formula
21 adopted by the Ninth Circuit—the lodestar is not exclusively applied, given the “uniqueness
22 of bankruptcy proceedings.” *Unsecured Creditors’ Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood,*
23 *Inc.*, 924 F.2d at 960. Further, a court may downwardly adjust a law firm’s fees with
24 reference to the work actually and reasonably performed, the value of that work to the
25 estate, the performance of the firm’s attorneys, the reasonable hourly rates for such work,
26 and the prevailing community rates, among other factors. *In re Morry Waksberg M.D., Inc.*,
27 692 Fed. Appx. 840, 842 (9th Cir. June 6, 2017) (quoting *In re Manoa Finance Co., Inc.*,
28 853 F.2d at 691).

1 When determining the amount of reasonable fees, the court's "examination . . .
2 should include the following questions: First, were the services authorized? Second, were
3 the services necessary or beneficial to the administration of the estate at the time they
4 were rendered? Third, are the services adequately documented? Fourth, are the fees
5 requested reasonable, taking into consideration the factors set forth in § 330(a)(3)?
6 Finally, . . . the court must [also consider] whether the professional exercised reasonable
7 billing judgment." *In re Mednet*, 251 B.R. 103, 108 (9th Cir. BAP 2000) (citation omitted).

8 Regarding the requirement that bankruptcy estate professionals exercise billing
9 judgment, the Ninth Circuit has stated that employment authorization does "not give [the
10 professional] free reign to run up a tab without considering the maximum probable
11 recovery." *Unsecured Creditors' Committee v. Puget Sound Plywood, Inc.*, 924 F.2d at
12 958. Before undertaking work on a bankruptcy matter, a professional is obligated to
13 consider:

- 14 (a) Is the burden of the probable cost of legal services disproportionately large in
15 relation to the size of the estate and maximum probable recovery?
- 16 (b) To what extent will the estate suffer if the services are not rendered?
- 17 (c) To what extent may the estate benefit if the services are rendered and what is
18 the likelihood of the disputed issues being resolved successfully?

19 *Id.* at 959-960 (citation omitted). Moreover, "[w]hen a cost benefit analysis indicates that
20 the only parties who will likely benefit from [a service] are the trustee and his
21 professionals,' the service is unwarranted and a court does not abuse its discretion in
22 denying fees for those services." *In re Mednet*, 251 B.R. at 108-109 (quoting *In re
Riverside-Linden Investment Co.*, 925 F.2d 320, 321 (9th Cir. 1991)).

23 A bankruptcy court has broad discretion to determine the number of hours
24 reasonably expended by a professional. *Wechsler v. Macke International Trade, Inc.* (*In re
Macke International Trade, Inc.*), 370 B.R. 236, 254 (9th Cir. BAP 2007). "[E]ven where
25 evidence supports [that] a particular number of hours [were] worked, the court may give
26 credit for fewer hours if the time claimed is 'excessive, redundant, or otherwise
27 credit for fewer hours if the time claimed is 'excessive, redundant, or otherwise

28

1 unnecessary.” *Id.* (quoting *Dawson v. Washington Mutual Bank, F.A. (In re Dawson)*, 390
2 F.3d 1139, 1152 (9th Cir. 2004)).

3 While “the applicant must demonstrate only that the services were ‘reasonably likely’
4 to benefit the estate at the time the services were rendered,” *In re Mednet*, 251 B.R. at
5 108, “an attorney fee application in bankruptcy will be denied to the extent that the services
6 rendered were for the benefit of the debtor and did not benefit the estate.” *In re Crown Oil,*
7 *Inc.*, 257 B.R. 531, 540 (Bankr. D. Mont. 2000) (quoting *Keate v. Miller (In re Kohl)*, 95 F.3d
8 713 (8th Cir. 1996)) (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). “This rule is based on
9 the legislative history of the Bankruptcy Code section 330(a) and the unfairness of allowing
10 the debtor to deplete the estate by pursuing its interests to the detriment of creditors.” *Id.*
11 (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). “The same unfairness occurs when a
12 debtor’s professionals seek to deplete the estate . . . to the detriment of the estate and
13 creditors.” *In re Crown Oil, Inc.*, 257 B.R. at 540.

14 Courts do not conclude that “only successful actions may be compensated under
15 § 330. To the contrary, so long as there was a reasonable chance of success which
16 outweighed the cost in pursuing the action, the fees relating thereto are compensable.
17 Moreover, professionals must often perform significant work in making the determination
18 whether a particular course of action could be successful. Such services are also
19 compensable so long as, at the outset, it was not clear that success was remote.” *In re*
20 *Crown Oil, Inc.*, 257 B.R. at 541 (quoting *In re Jefsaba, Inc.*, 172 B.R. 786, 789 (Bankr.
21 E.D. Pa. 1994)) (internal quotation marks omitted). “On the other hand, whether a
22 reorganization is successful is a factor to be considered in determining whether a debtor’s
23 counsel’s services provide a benefit to the estate.” *In re Crown Oil, Inc.*, 257 B.R. at 541
24 (citing *In re MFlex Corp.*, 172 B.R. 854, 857 (Bankr. W.D. Tex. 1994) and *In re Lederman*
25 *Enterprises, Inc.*, 143 B.R. 772, 775 (D. Colo. 1992), *affirmed*, 997 F.2d 1321 (10th Cir.
26 1993)).

27 The court has reviewed the Fee Application of LODAT, including all billing entries,
28 pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 and the lodestar method. The court identified specific tasks

1 performed by LODAT and its professionals which were objected to by Debtor or otherwise
2 potentially problematic based on the court's independent duty to review the
3 reasonableness of the time billed and tasks performed. As discussed herein, the court
4 determines that not all the of the requested fees are reasonable, and the court has reduced
5 the award by disallowing the fees that are not reasonable. The court has determined that
6 some of Debtor's objections to the requested fees have merit, but other objections lacked
7 merit. The court has also determined that other requested fees are not reasonable
8 pursuant to its independent duty to review the fees.

9 **C. Application**

10 On the original Fee Application, LODAT requested \$57,040.00 in fees, \$3,087.42 in
11 expenses, and a total balance due of \$46,577.72 based on payments previously made.
12 ECF 112. LODAT's final Fee Application, including the Supplemental Application, included
13 fees and costs for the entire case of \$89,915.23, with an unfunded balance due of
14 \$67,233.34. ECF 138 at 7-8.

15 Pursuant to the court's order entered on May 22, 2019, ECF 141, LODAT provided
16 the court with an electronic copy of LODAT's final billing entries in Microsoft Excel
17 spreadsheet format, which showed the fees requested in the Fee Application. The court
18 had ordered the parties to submit the billing entries and objections in spreadsheet form in
19 order for the court to make rulings on each individual billing entry and each objection. The
20 court has used the Microsoft Excel spreadsheet file containing LODAT's billing entries to
21 make its rulings thereon. The court notes that the total amount of fees on the spreadsheet
22 filed as ordered by the court was \$82,488.55, which is less than the total fees of
23 \$89,915.34 on the last amended fee application filed on April 22, 2019, ECF 138. The
24 difference in fees is primarily attributable to the fee categories of Final Fee Application
25 Charges (\$24,685.45 vs. \$21,621.13) and Fee Application Mediation (\$5,552.47 vs. \$0.00).
26 The court bases its rulings on the billing entries on the fee spreadsheet since the court
27
28

1 specifically ordered LODAT to submit the electronic spreadsheet in order for the court to
2 make its rulings.⁸ See also *supra* at 3 n.2.

3 **i. Debtor's Objections**

4 On October 11, 2018, Debtor filed a Declaration in Opposition of Final Application
5 for Professional Compensation Including Counsel's Business Practices and Standards of
6 Care. ECF 115. Specifically, Debtor objected to six categories of fees: Motion for
7 Withdrawal (Firm Employment and Compensation); Preparation of a Plan Spreadsheet
8 (Planned Disclosure Statement); Monthly Operating Disbursement Reports (U.S. Trustee
9 Matters); Wells Fargo Mortgage Modification (Planned Disclosure Statement); Plan and
10 Disclosure Charges (Firm Employment and Compensation); Firm Employment &
11 Compensation (Firm Employment and Compensation). *Id.* at 6. Debtor also objected to
12 certain individual billing entries. *Id.* at 8 (e.g., "10/24/17 – Left Message - \$50.00 . . .").

13 On January 29, 2019, Debtor filed an Amended Declaration in opposition to the Fee
14 Application. ECF 124. Debtor's declaration made similar arguments addressing the
15 reasonableness of LODAT's fees, including that work on the plan spreadsheet, loan
16 modification with Wells Fargo Bank, and monthly reports was not reasonably billed. ECF
17 124. Debtor also disputed that LODAT's post-withdrawal fees were compensable. *Id.* at
18 32. On July 23, 2019, Debtor filed a final Motion in Opposition to the Fee Application, ECF
19 152, which restated Debtor's general objections to the Fee Application and included
20 objections to specific billing entries in the spreadsheet LODAT provided the court and
21 parties as a result of the court's May 22, 2019 order, ECF 141 (requiring electronic
22 spreadsheets of disputed billing entries).

23 **ii. LODAT's Defense of the Fee Application**

24 On October 17, 2018, LODAT filed its Reply to Debtor's initial Declaration and
25 Opposition Regarding Final Fee Application (the "Reply"). ECF 116. The Reply argued
26 that Debtor's unreasonable expectations, changing goals, and failure to assist counsel had

27 ⁸ In any event, the additional fees for Final Fee Application Charges and Fee Application Mediation
28 would not have been allowed because they were for services rendered in defense of the Fee Application as
discussed herein.

1 caused the disputed billing issues, including the amount of work on the plan spreadsheet
2 and loan modification. *Id.* at 2-3.

3 On February 25, 2019, in response to the amended declaration filed by Debtor on
4 the eve of trial, LODAT filed its Supplemental Reply and Objections (the “Supplemental
5 Reply”). ECF 127. The Supplemental Reply addressed Debtor’s declarations and the
6 disputed billing entries, including the work on the plan spreadsheet. *Id.* at 5. LODAT
7 argued that communications that Debtor complained of, such as calls and e-mails, were
8 made necessary by Debtor’s conduct. *Id.* at 5-7. Additionally, LODAT argued that fees
9 related to monthly reports, its withdrawal, and the instant fee dispute were also
10 compensable. *Id.*

11 **iii. The Court’s Determinations**

12 The court’s rulings on all individual billing entries, including those specifically
13 objected to by Debtor, are set forth in Exhibit A attached to this memorandum decision (the
14 “Rulings Spreadsheet”).⁹ The court addresses the parties’ broader contentions below.

15 The Fee Application lists categories for fees for the various services that were
16 rendered by LODAT in this case, and it is useful to consider the fee categories first.¹⁰ Of
17 note, the fee category of “B02: Final Fee Application Charges” primarily represents fees for
18 services performed by LODAT in defense of its fee application. As discussed herein, these
19 fees are impermissible under the Supreme Court’s decision in *Baker Botts*. The court has
20 disallowed most, if not all, of these fees. The court also disallowed fees for services

21
22 ⁹ Schedule A also includes a court-generated spreadsheet based on the data provided by LODAT,
23 *LODAT Billing Category Totals*, which shows the disallowed and allowed fees on a per-category basis
24 instead of by individual billing entry.

25
26
27
28 ¹⁰ In its supplemental and final fee application, ECF 138, LODAT categorized its fees as follows:
- A: Services Not in Any Other Category (or Ch. 11 General)
- B: Firm Employment and Compensation
- B01: Motion to Withdraw
- B02: Final Fee Application Charges
- B03: Fee Application Mediation
- C: U.S. Trustee Matters
- F: Claims
- G: Employment and Compensation of other Professionals
- M: Use, Sale or Lease of Estate Assets
- T: Plan and Disclosure Statement Services

1 rendered by LODAT in support of its motion to withdraw from the case, "B01: Motion to
2 Withdraw," because such services were not for the benefit of the estate, but for itself.

3 Aside the fees of \$24,831.96 as reflected in the billing spreadsheet for defending the
4 fee application or for moving to withdraw, this leaves roughly \$57,656.59 in fees requested
5 by LODAT with respect to representation of Debtor. The court has reviewed all of the fees
6 for reasonableness pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 330 and has made rulings on all of Debtor's
7 objections to the extent that the court could discern the objections. The court was not able
8 to discern all of Debtor's objections because some objections were misidentified as to the
9 date that the objection was rendered, and thus, the court was unable to rule on such
10 objections. To the extent that the court could, it made a specific ruling on the objection
11 made by Debtor as to the specific billing entry, whether to sustain or overrule the objection
12 in part or in whole. With respect to some of the fee categories, few, if any, of the fees were
13 disallowed because Debtor did not interpose objections and the court did not otherwise find
14 that the fees were unreasonable. See *Rulings Spreadsheet*, Exhibit A at "A: Services Not
15 in Any Other Category (Ch. 11 General)," "B: Firm Employment and Compensation," "C:
16 U.S. Trustee Matters," "F: Claims," "G: Employment and Compensation of other
17 Professionals," "M: Use, Sale or Lease of Estate Assets."

18 With respect to other fee categories, some of the fees were disallowed because the
19 court found that Debtor's objections had merit, or the court determined that the fees were
20 otherwise not reasonable. The major fee category that drew Debtor's objections was with
21 respect to disclosure statement and plan confirmation, "T: Plan and Disclosure Statement
22 Services," and the court sustained many but not all of Debtor's objections after determining
23 that the objections had merit, and the court did not have information to show that the fees
24 were otherwise reasonable. With respect to the disclosure statement and plan
25 confirmation category, the court allowed a slight majority of the fees claimed as reasonable
26 and disallowed a just less than half of the fees requested.

27 However, the court now generally discusses the fee rulings in the context of the
28 case as a whole. This bankruptcy case was straightforward and did not present complex

1 issues. The primary issue in this case involved the plan treatment of Debtor's home
2 lender, Wells Fargo Bank, which held the first lien on the residence, which issue was
3 eventually consensually resolved with minimal litigation effort. The court does not wish to
4 detract from the efforts of LODAT, which successfully negotiated a loan modification and
5 plan treatment of the secured claim of Debtor's senior home lender. The litigation in the
6 case consisted of mainly routine case administrative matters (i.e., case status conferences,
7 hearings on approval of disclosure statement and plan confirmation) and uncontested
8 litigation proceedings (i.e., only one claim objection and the sole dispute regarding
9 approval of the disclosure statement with Wells Fargo Bank was promptly and
10 consensually resolved). However, because the court considers the lodestar analysis in
11 reviewing the fees requested here, the court determines that the amount of time spent on
12 the case by LODAT was not entirely reasonable, and thus, the fees are excessive to some
13 degree.

14 The case was simple and straightforward because the major issue was the dispute
15 with the senior home lender, which was consensually resolved, and there was no dispute
16 with other creditors as their claims were consensually resolved through the plan. There
17 was only one objection to a claim, which was unopposed. Debtor's income consisted of
18 two sources, social security and income from his consulting business, and his expenses
19 were his personal expenses.

20 As was stated in the initial case status report prepared by LODAT for Debtor in this
21 case, the case was going to be resolved through negotiation or a Chapter 13 style cure
22 plan. The confirmed plan in the case was a simple plan based on a loan modification of
23 the senior secured claim and lien on the residence, consensual payment of the other
24 secured claims and priority tax claims and payment of general unsecured claims in full
25 without interest over 47 months. The plan would be funded from two sources of Debtor's
26 net monthly disposable income, that is, Debtor's social security income, and his business
27 consulting income. Thus, the plan in this case bore strong similarities to a 5 year Chapter
28 13 plan. The plan and disclosure statements were on official court "fill in the blank" form

1 documents with some very brief attachments. As LODAT's principal, David Tilem, said at
2 trial, this was a simple, supersized Chapter 13 style case. *Audio Recording of Trial*,
3 January 30, 2019 at 9:33 a.m.

4 There is no dispute that the case was straightforward and did not require much
5 disclosure to comprehend the plan as Debtor's motion to approve the disclosure statement
6 prepared by LODAT stated. ECF 62 at 3. The question is, why would this simple and
7 straightforward Chapter 13 style individual Chapter 11 bankruptcy case take about 67.30
8 hours of professional, mostly attorney, time resulting in nearly \$32,000 in fees to prepare
9 the form "fill in the blanks" plan and disclosure statement documents and to obtain
10 disclosure statement approval and plan confirmation, which were minimally contested.¹¹
11 As set forth in the attached Rulings Spreadsheet, the court has reviewed the fees for
12 reasonableness and has determined that the requested amount of approximately \$32,000
13 is excessive and unreasonable, but an amount of approximately \$16,000 of these
14 requested fees is reasonable under a lodestar method analysis as set forth in the court's
15 Rulings Spreadsheet.

16 Much of the focus of Debtor's objections and the court's scrutiny is on the time billed
17 for preparing plan and disclosure statement attachments and communications between
18 Debtor and his counsel, LODAT. The plan and disclosure statement attachments are
19 short, simple documents dealing with simple issues, and are so abbreviated that the court
20 could quote them verbatim in this decision without making the decision excessively long.
21 The court cannot identify why it would have taken counsel so long to prepare these
22 attachments because they dealt with simple, discrete issues, such as scheduling of claims
23 and computation of Debtor's household income, which could have been handled by a
24 paralegal rather than an attorney. The time required to complete such attachments is
25 unreasonable, and LODAT has not shown why the time billed for preparing such
26 attachments is reasonable, given the simplicity of the content of these attachments.

27
28¹¹ Only Wells Fargo Bank filed an opposition to the Debtor's first plan, which opposition was
consensually resolved by the Stipulation. ECF 74.

1 Under the lodestar method, the court determines that LODAT's billing rates were
2 reasonable and appropriate based on the services rendered and the fees typically charged
3 in Chapter 11 cases in this district. Although LODAT's principal, David Tilem, testified that
4 his usual billing rate is \$600.00 per hour, his billing rate of \$500.00 per hour in light of his
5 experience as a bankruptcy practitioner is reasonable. The rates of LODAT's other
6 professionals, the former associate attorney at \$300.00 per hour, and the paralegals at
7 \$100.00 per hour and \$150.00 per hour were also reasonable.

8 The issue raised by Debtor in his objections was the use of higher cost
9 professionals on tasks which should have been performed by lower cost professionals. In
10 the early stage of the case, June 2017 to August 2017, this was not an issue because work
11 was appropriately delegated to lower cost professionals, and Debtor had no specific
12 objections to services during this time. However, after the associate attorney left LODAT,
13 Mr. Tilem was left as the only attorney at the firm—with his \$500.00 per hour billing rate.
14 As discussed below and in the court's Rulings Spreadsheet, the issue is not so much Mr.
15 Tilem's rate *per se*, but his billing of services for clerical tasks that he performed, such as
16 preparing arithmetic computations of income and expenses for plan documents, which did
17 not require an attorney to perform and should not have been billed at attorney rates. See
18 Memorandum Decision Granting in Part Request for Allowance and Payment of
19 Administrative Claim by the Bankruptcy Law Firm, P.C., *In re Morry Waksberg M.D., Inc.*,
20 No. 2:06-bk-16101-BB Chapter 7, slip op. at 16-18 (Bankr. C.D. Cal., filed and entered on
21 April 20, 2015), *affirmed in relevant part sub nom. The Bankruptcy Law Firm, P.C. v. Siegel*
22 (*In re Morry Waksberg M.D., Inc.*), BAP No. CC-15-1109 TaKuKi, 2015 WL 9437343, slip
23 op. at *7 and n. 7 (9th Cir. BAP, unpublished opinion filed on December 22, 2015), *affirmed*
24 *in relevant part and reversed and remanded on other grounds*, 692 Fed. Appx. 840, 841-
25 842 (9th Cir. 2017) (unpublished opinion).

26 The court addresses the reasonableness of the time spent on individual tasks
27 pursuant to the lodestar method below and in its individual rulings found in the Rulings
28

1 Spreadsheet.¹² Because the court determined that the fees requested in connection with
2 the motion to withdraw and defense of the fee application are not compensable as a matter
3 of law because the motion to withdraw was for the benefit of LODAT, and not the
4 bankruptcy estate, and services for defense of a fee application do not benefit the
5 bankruptcy estate, the reasonableness of the time spent on those tasks is not material.
6 Accordingly, the court discusses the reasonableness under the lodestar method of the fees
7 billed by LODAT for services relating to the plan and disclosure statement and other issues
8 arising in the case.

9 **iv. Fees Requested for Defense of Fee Application**

10 The court has reviewed LODAT's fees of \$21,621.13 claimed in its fee spreadsheet
11 under the category of "Final Fee Application Charges" and has made rulings on the billing
12 entries as set forth in the attached Rulings Spreadsheet.¹³ The court has disallowed nearly
13 all of the fees in this category because they were the result of services in *defense* of the
14 Fee Application and not services rendered *preparing* the Fee Application.

15 Courts evaluating fee applications must distinguish between *preparing* a fee
16 application and *defending* a fee application. *Baker Botts L.L.P. v. ASARCO LLC*, 135 S.Ct.
17 2158, 2167, 192 L. Ed. 2d 208 (2015). The Supreme Court stated in *Baker Botts* that "[a]
18 [11 U.S.C.] §327(a) professional's preparations of a fee application is best understood as a
19 'servic[e] rendered' to the estate administrator under §330(a)(1), whereas a professional's
20 defense of that application is not." The Supreme Court also stated: "Any compensation
21 awarded for the preparation of a fee application shall be based on the level and skill
22 reasonably required to prepare the application," 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(6), while 11 U.S.C.
23 § 330(a)(1) does not permit bankruptcy courts to award fees to bankruptcy estate
24

25 ¹² Fees that the court was required to disallow because the fee was either Unnecessary Duplication of
26 Services under 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A)(i); Services that were Not Reasonably Likely to Benefit the Debtor's
27 Estate under 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A)(ii)(I); or, Services that were Not Necessary to the Administration of the
28 Case under 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(4)(A)(ii)(II) are set forth in the individual rulings in Schedule A.

¹³ The court notes that the Fee Application contained a fee category of "Fee Application Mediation," but
there were no such entries on LODAT's fee spreadsheet. It appears that this fee category was subsumed in
the fee category of "Final Fee Application Charges."

1 professionals for defending their fee applications, *Baker Botts L.L.P. v. ASARCO LLC*, 135
2 S.Ct. at 2164-2166.

3 In *Baker Botts*, two law firms employed by the estate to represent the debtor in
4 possession sought compensation under 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1), and the debtor objected to
5 the fee applications. *Baker Botts L.L.P. v. ASARCO LLC*, 135 S.Ct. at 2163. After
6 extensive discovery and a six-day trial, the bankruptcy court rejected the debtor's
7 objections and awarded the fees, including an additional amount for time spent litigating
8 defense of the fee applications. *Id.* The Supreme Court ultimately disagreed. The
9 Supreme Court began with the basic point of reference when considering the award of
10 attorneys' fees, which is the "American Rule," whereby each litigant pays its own attorneys'
11 fees, win or lose, unless a statute or contract provides otherwise. *Id.* at 2164 (collecting
12 cases). "Congress did not expressly depart from the American Rule to permit
13 compensation for fee-defense litigation by professionals hired to assist trustees [or debtors
14 in possession] in bankruptcy proceedings." *Id.*¹⁴ The text of 11 U.S.C. § 330(a)(1) "cannot
15 displace the American Rule with respect to fee-defense litigation" because "the phrase
16 'reasonable compensation for actual, necessary services rendered' permits courts to award
17 fees to attorneys for work done to assist the administrator of the estate," and "[t]he word
18 'services' ordinarily refers to 'labor performed for another.'" *Id.* (citing Webster's New
19 International Dictionary 2288 (def. 4) (2d ed. 1934)) (emphasis added). The Supreme
20 Court concluded in *Baker Botts* that "[b]ecause § 330(a)(1) does not explicitly override the
21 American Rule with respect to fee-defense litigation, it does not permit bankruptcy courts to
22 award compensation for such litigation." *Id.* at 2169.

23 The Ninth Circuit follows the rule of *Baker Botts* disallowing fees for the defense of
24 an application of a bankruptcy professional for fees as an administrative expense of the
25 bankruptcy estate pursuant to 11 U.S.C. § 503(b)(1)(A)(i), but allowing fees for the
26
27

28 ¹⁴ 11 U.S.C. § 1107(a) gives Chapter 11 debtors in possession generally the same authority as
trustees, including the authority to retain 11 U.S.C. § 327(a) professionals.

1 preparation of a fee application. *The Bankruptcy Law Firm, P.C. v. Siegel (In re Morry*
2 *Waksberg M.D., Inc.),* 692 Fed. Appx. at 841.

3 At trial, LODAT argued that such fees are for services in “prosecuting” the Fee
4 Application, citing *In re Nucorp Energy, Inc.*, 764 F.2d 655 (9th Cir. 1985). However, the
5 court’s review of the fees indicates that the fees were for services in defense of the Fee
6 Application against objections of Debtor rather than in preparation of the Fee Application.
7 As shown by the court’s rulings on the attached Rulings Spreadsheet, the court has
8 allowed fees for the preparation of the Fee Application while disallowing fees for the
9 defense of the Fee Application, which is consistent with the *Baker Botts* and *Waksberg*
10 cases. Although the Supreme Court’s decision in *Baker Botts* is directly applicable to
11 LODAT’s fees for defending its fee application, LODAT does not discuss the *Baker Botts*
12 case in its Fee Application or briefing in support of the application. ECF 98, 112, 116, 127
13 and 138. The case of *Nucorp Energy* does not support LODAT’s argument because that
14 case only holds that fees in preparation of a fee application are compensable which is
15 consistent with *Baker Botts* and does not support any argument that fees for services in
16 defense of a fee application are compensable. *In re Nucorp Energy, Inc.*, 764 F.2d at 658-
17 659. To the extent that LODAT argues that the language of *Nucorp Energy* that the
18 “preparation and presentation” of attorney fee applications in bankruptcy cases covers fees
19 for defense, that argument is inconsistent with *Baker Botts* and *Waksberg*, which must be
20 rejected.

21 **v. Fees Requested for Fee Application Mediation**

22 Although LODAT requested fees of \$5,552.47 on its Supplemental Fee Application
23 under the fee category of “Fee Application Mediation,” LODAT does not claim fees under
24 this fee category in its fee spreadsheet. The court does not allow fees under this category
25 because the billing entries for the fees were not submitted on the fee spreadsheet as
26 ordered by the court. Alternatively, the court would have disallowed the fees in this
27 category because they are for services in defense of the Fee Application since the purpose
28

1 of the mediation was to resolve the dispute between Debtor and LODAT arising from
2 Debtor's objections to the Fee Application.

3 **vi. Fees Requested for LODAT's Motion to Withdraw**

4 The court has reviewed LODAT's fees of \$3,210.83 claimed on its fee spreadsheet
5 under the category of "Motion to Withdraw" and has made rulings on the billing entries as
6 set forth in the attached Rulings Spreadsheet. The court has disallowed most of the fees
7 in this category because they did not benefit the estate as required by 11 U.S.C. § 330, as
8 the motion to withdraw was only for the benefit of LODAT and not for the benefit of the
9 estate.

10 **vii. Fees Requested for Plan and Disclosure Statement Services**

11 The court has reviewed LODAT's fees of \$31,878.24 for 67.3 hours of professional,
12 mostly attorney, services claimed on its fee spreadsheet under the category of "Plan and
13 Disclosure Statement Services" and has made rulings on the billing entries as set forth in
14 the attached Rulings Spreadsheet. The court has disallowed approximately half of the fees
15 in this category and allowed half of the fees as set forth in the specific rulings on the
16 attached Rulings Spreadsheet.

17 The court in this narrative provides further explanation for its rulings on the fees in this
18 category. As previously stated, this was a simple and straightforward Chapter 13 style
19 case, which was resolved without much contested litigation. The approach to the case by
20 Debtor and his bankruptcy counsel, LODAT, was to obtain confirmation of a Chapter 13
21 style plan by resolving the major dispute with the home lender, Wells Fargo Bank, with the
22 senior lien on Debtor's residence. The Real Property was the only substantial asset of the
23 bankruptcy estate, and the plan proposed obtaining a loan modification and consensual
24 plan treatment by payment of the other secured claims, priority tax claims and general
25 unsecured claims in full. Like in a Chapter 13 plan, the plan would be funded by Debtor's
26 net monthly disposable income, which came from two sources, that is, Debtor's social
27 security income, and his business consulting income. Thus, the plan in this case bore
28 strong similarities to a five-year Chapter 13 plan.

1 As discussed above, the plan and disclosure statements were prepared by LODAT on
2 the court's official "fill in the blank" form documents for individual Chapter 11 debtors, which
3 bear similarities to the court's Chapter 13 plan form documents. LODAT added
4 attachments to the court's form plan and disclosure statement documents, which contained
5 additional special plan and disclosure provisions. The court has reviewed the form plan
6 and disclosure statement documents, and these documents themselves should not have
7 taken very much time to fill in the blanks. Moreover, the court has reviewed the plan and
8 disclosure statement attachments containing the special plan and disclosure statement
9 provisions, and these provisions should not have taken very much time to prepare.

10 The motion to approve the disclosure statement was a page and a half of text, which
11 simply asserted that not much disclosure was required for the plan, but that the disclosure
12 was adequate under Section 1125 of the Bankruptcy Code. No other authorities were cited
13 in the motion. In the court's estimation, a reasonable time to complete this document
14 would be one hour of attorney time.

15 The motion to approve the disclosure statement was briefly contested by one
16 creditor, Wells Fargo Bank, and to LODAT's credit, it was able to expeditiously resolve the
17 objection of the bank to the disclosure statement and plan by agreeing to a very favorable
18 loan modification for Debtor, that is, a 40 year reamortization of the existing 30 year loan
19 that provided for recapitalization of the loan arrearages into the reamortized loan at a
20 favorable interest rate of 4.65%, slightly above the 4% proposed in the plan. Contrary to
21 Debtor's assertions that LODAT lacked experience to negotiate a loan modification with the
22 bank, it had considerable experience in negotiating loan modification in bankruptcy case,
23 which showed in the favorable result in resolving the dispute with the bank, and thus, the
24 court has overruled most, if not all, of Debtor's objections to the fees requested by LODAT
25 for resolving the dispute with the bank.

26 As previously noted, the main body of the disclosure statement was the court's form
27 disclosure statement for individual Chapter 11 debtors. LODAT filled in the blanks
28 regarding terms of payment of the various claims under the plan and sources of income of

1 Debtor to fund the payments under the plan. In the court's estimation, a reasonable time to
2 complete this document would be two hours of attorney time.

3 LODAT prepared the three page disclosure statement attachment, which contained
4 special disclosure statement provisions consisting of a one-half page ballot instruction, a
5 chart of Debtor's monthly household income from January 2013 to December 2017, a one-
6 quarter page statement on claim objections, and a one paragraph statement on LODAT's
7 attorney fees. In the court's estimation, a reasonable time to complete these special plan
8 provisions would be one hour and one half of attorney time, except as to completion of the
9 monthly household chart which was essentially a computational task gathering Debtor's
10 social security income and bank records and interviewing Debtor regarding these records,
11 which would reasonably involve 5 hours of paralegal time and 2 hours of attorney time.

12 LODAT prepared the five exhibits to the disclosure statement, which included an
13 updated income and expense statement for Debtor's household, modified real and
14 personal property schedules to provide liquidation values, a claims schedule, a plan ballot,
15 a statement regarding assumption of executory contracts and a declaration of Debtor in
16 support of the disclosure statement. The completion of the updated income and expense
17 statement should not have taken much time since it is a "fill in the blank" form, and the
18 workup should have been based on the work for the monthly household income chart for
19 the disclosure statement attachment. The completion of the modified real and personal
20 property schedules should not have taken much time because it was a modification of the
21 real and personal property schedules filed with the bankruptcy petition. The claims
22 schedule should not have taken much time because the information would be taken from
23 the claims scheduled on the petition and listed on the claims register. The plan ballot is a
24 form document which should not have taken long to complete. The statement on
25 assumption of executory contracts and unexpired leases should not have taken much time
26 since the statement was that there were no such contracts or leases to assume. In the
27 court's estimation, a reasonable time to complete these exhibits which were essentially
28 computational tasks relating to Debtor's household income already being done for the

1 disclosure statement attachment and modifying the property schedules and preparing form
2 documents, which would reasonably involve 6 hours of paralegal time and 2 hours of
3 attorney time.

4 As previously noted, the main body of the plan was the court's form plan for individual
5 Chapter 11 debtors, which includes boilerplate language on treatment of unclassified
6 claims, classification and treatment of claims, allowance and disallowance of claim,
7 executory contracts and unexpired leases, means of implementation, discharge and effects
8 of confirmation and general plan provisions. LODAT filled in the blanks regarding
9 treatment of claims and plan duration. In the court's estimation, a reasonable time to
10 complete this document would be one hour of attorney time.

11 LODAT prepared the two page plan attachment, which contained special plan
12 provisions.¹⁵ In the court's estimation, a reasonable time to complete this document would
13 be two hours of attorney time.

14 In addition, the court estimates that reasonable times for: (1) appearance of a
15 disclosure statement hearing, 1.0 hour of attorney time; (2) preparation of an amended
16 plan based on the stipulation with Wells Fargo Bank, 2.0 hours of attorney time; (3)
17 preparation of a confirmation brief, 2.0 hours of attorney time; (4) appearance at a
18 confirmation hearing, 1.0 hour of attorney time; (5) litigation support by paralegal staff,
19 including order preparation, 3.0 hours of paralegal time; (6) client communications re:
20 same: 2 hours of attorney time. In the court's view, a reasonable estimate of time for plan
21 and disclosure statement services in this case would have been 35 hours of professional
22 time, 20 hours of attorney time and 15 hours of paralegal time, yet the actual time billed for
23 such services was over 60 hours. The court's rulings on the reasonableness of the fees
24 requested under the lodestar method of analysis are close to this rough estimate.

25
26 ¹⁵ The plan provisions consisted of a one-paragraph addendum discussing Debtor's ability to pay
27 anticipated legal fees, a three-paragraph addendum discussing Debtor's federal and state income and self-
28 employment tax liabilities for 2015 through 2018, a one-paragraph addendum discussing his settlement
proposal with the senior home lender, a half page addendum discussing the plan treatment of the claim of
secured claimant, Gregory Creighton, and a one-paragraph addendum discussing monthly plan payments on
claims of Class 6(b) general unsecured creditors with or without allowance of the claim of AMEX.

1 The court has considered the arguments of LODAT as to why the higher fees
2 requested for such services are reasonable as set forth below. In LODAT's reply to
3 Debtor's Declaration and Opposition Regarding Final Fee Application, ECF 116, filed on
4 October 17, 2018, it asserted that additional charges related to the plan spreadsheet
5 resulted from Debtor's failure to provide "good numbers," that is, Debtor would provide one
6 set of numbers, only to replace, update or revise them, which went on for "many weeks"
7 after "warning after warning that the deadline was fast approaching." *Id.* Based on the
8 trial testimony of LODAT's principal, David Tilem, the amount of time and expense needed
9 to perform the task of preparing the plan and disclosure statement increased because
10 LODAT made extra efforts to reconcile the information on Debtor's bank records with
11 Debtor's representations of his income. According to Mr. Tilem, LODAT was under time
12 constraints to meet the filing deadline of January 31, 2018 to file the plan and disclosure
13 statement and it did not have adequate information from Debtor to reconcile the income
14 data with the numbers needed to put on the plan documents. LODAT also stated that it
15 needed to communicate more with Debtor to obtain the information to compute accurate
16 income figures for the plan documents and to use computer expertise to compute income
17 figures on Microsoft Excel spreadsheets. According to Mr. Tilem, he was the only person
18 in the office, among himself as the sole attorney and three paralegals, who had
19 competence in Microsoft Excel to make the computations, which in his view justified the
20 billing of computational work at his usual billing rate. However, the work of computing the
21 historic income figures is strictly computational and could have been done manually on
22 paper without the need for a computerized spreadsheet. What needs to be done was to
23 obtain the social security income records and the bank records showing deposits from
24 Debtor's household and time to review them and interview Debtor regarding the documents
25 to reconcile them with Debtor's representations. While LODAT asserts that additional
26 professional time was needed in order to meet a disclosure statement filing deadline in
27 January 2018. The court does not see why LODAT considered there were time constraints
28 in obtaining accurate financial data from Debtor's household since the case was filed in

1 June 2017 and the disclosure statement filing deadline was over 6 months later in January
2 2018. There was plenty of time, over 6 months, to obtain and assemble Debtor's financial
3 data and to interview Debtor by LODAT's paralegal staff, who should have performed this
4 task rather than its higher billing attorney.

5 In the initial reply to Debtor's opposition, LODAT also argued that the medical
6 problems of Debtor's wife should not be used to reduce LODAT's fees as the scope of
7 these problems "could not [or] seek to reduce counsel's fees because Debtor faced other
8 pressures." ECF 116 at 2-3. The court has considered this argument and notes that
9 Debtor has not objected to LODAT's fees on this basis, nor has the court disallowed
10 LODAT's fees on this basis as indicated on the court's schedule of rulings.

11 In the initial reply to the opposition, LODAT further argued that "Debtor's failure to
12 'take care of business' resulted in the need for much more hand-holding than would or
13 could normally have been anticipated." ECF 116 at 2. Specifically, LODAT argues: "One
14 particular concern has to do with various deed of trust[s] recorded against the Debtor's
15 residence which could and should have been reconveyed early in the case." *Id.* The court
16 has considered this argument and has not allowed LODAT's fees relating to the various
17 deeds of trust against Debtor's residence, and it does not appear that Debtor's objections
18 related to fees in connection with this work. The court has sustained Debtor's objections
19 and disallowed fees for excessive time for the tasks performed as indicated on the court's
20 Rulings Spreadsheet, which may or may not relate to LODAT's "hand-holding" issue,
21 because the court has taken into consideration the nature of the tasks performed and the
22 reasonableness of the time to perform such tasks.

23 LODAT also argued that "Debtor's insistence on pursuing unrealistic and changing
24 goals was responsible for most of the unanticipated expenses." ECF 116 at 3.
25 Specifically, LODAT argued: "Debtor states that all he wanted was a mortgage modification
26 – but this result was refused by the lender – not by Debtor's counsel." *Id.* The court has
27 considered this argument and has generally allowed LODAT's fees for loan modification
28 and developing strategies for resolving the dispute with the senior home lender, and

1 overruled most, if not all, of Debtor's objections to fees for this work as indicated on the
2 court's Rulings Spreadsheet.

3 In the initial reply, LODAT further argued that Debtor asked its attorney to try to
4 assume a policy of long term care insurance, which generated fees in determining that the
5 odds were low and the effort abandoned, and thus, it should not be penalized for doing
6 what Debtor requested. ECF 116 at 3. The court has allowed some fees for this work as
7 Debtor admitted that he asked LODAT about the long term care insurance, but disallowed
8 some fees because there was no benefit to the estate as the question should have been
9 answered in a shorter period of time.

10 LODAT finally argued that additional work was performed because "Debtor's
11 expectations of the Chapter 11 process morphed throughout the case." ECF 116 at 3.
12 The only specific example of the fees for services performed as a result of this was the
13 proposal of a reverse mortgage as a strategy to keep Debtor and his wife in the home.
14 The court has considered this argument and has overruled most, if not all, of Debtor's
15 objections to fees for this work, generally allowing LODAT's fees for loan modification and
16 developing strategies for resolving the dispute with the senior home lender, including its
17 reverse mortgage suggestion as indicated on the court's Rulings Spreadsheet.

18 In LODAT's supplemental reply to Debtor's opposition, ECF 127, filed on February 25,
19 2019, LODAT argued that "Debtor's most significant challenge is his assertion that Counsel
20 spent an excessive amount of time mechanically entering data into a spreadsheet at a cost
21 of \$12,300. Nothing could be further from the truth." ECF 127 at 17.¹⁶ According to
22 LODAT, "[t]hough Counsel attempted to develop suitable (accurate) income and expense
23 information starting in mid-December [2017] (and even working through the New Year
24 holiday), Debtor procrastinated until days before the January 31, 2018 filing deadline.
25 When information was provided, it proved to be inconsistent with bank statement

26
27 ¹⁶ The plan spreadsheet was not part of the filed disclosure statement and the plan, but a working document
28 prepared by LODAT to generate the income and expense charts in the attachments to those documents. A
version of the plan spreadsheet was attached to Debtor's Amended Declaration as Exhibit 12. ECF 125-2 at
1-5. See also, *Debtor's Amended Declaration*, ECF 125 at 20-24.

1 information (reflected on the Monthly Operating Reports) or tax return information and, in
2 some cases, defied common sense (examples include no budget line item for clothing,
3 business equipment repairs and maintenance or income taxes). Debtor had still not filed
4 some of his income tax returns making income information unreliable, and information on
5 the unfiled returns was inconsistent with Debtor's representations regarding his income."
6 *Id.* at 18-19. LODAT said that in order to meet the disclosure statement filing deadline, its
7 attorney reviewed Debtor's monthly operating reports, prepared and sent the spreadsheet
8 and reviewed it with Debtor line by line, communicated with Debtor regarding the various
9 expense items, conferred with Debtor's accountant regarding the reasonableness of
10 expense items, used Microsoft Excel functions to interpolate missing data, calculated
11 averages and attempted other means to gather reliable information. *Id.* at 19. As indicated
12 in the court's rulings on the fees for the plan and disclosure statement services and
13 Debtor's objections thereto, the problem is that much of this work performed by counsel
14 was clerical in nature because it was compiling numerical data and computing this data to
15 derive historical and projected income and expense figures, which lower cost professionals
16 should have performed, and not a higher billing attorney. The time crunch was
17 manufactured here because LODAT itself procrastinated and did not ask Debtor to
18 produce the income and bank records to derive the numerical data until mid-December
19 2017 when the deadline was approaching a month later at the end of January 2018. This
20 resulted in unnecessary communications and extra work which could have been avoided if
21 LODAT tasked this work to its lower billing paralegals as soon as the engagement begun
22 before it filed the bankruptcy case for Debtor in June 2017, more than six months before
23 the disclosure statement filing deadline of January 31, 2018. The court has considered
24 LODAT's billing entries, Debtor's objections thereto, and LODAT's reply arguments and
25 has made rulings in consideration of these matters as set forth in the attached Rulings
26 Spreadsheet.

27 In LODAT's supplemental reply to Debtor's opposition to the Fee Application, LODAT
28 addresses categories of objections to its fees rather than to the specific objections made

1 by Debtor in his pleadings filed in July 2019. The court has based its rulings primarily on
2 Debtor's objections to specific billing entries in the Fee Application set forth in his July 2019
3 pleadings rather than his more generalized objections in his prior pleadings. LODAT did
4 not file any reply to Debtor's specific objections in July 2019, though at the hearing on
5 August 28, 2019, the court inquired of LODAT if it wished to reply to these specific
6 objections, which it declined. *Audio Recording of Hearing*, August 28, 2019 at 11:50-11:51
7 a.m. The court lists LODAT's arguments in reply to the generalized objections of Debtor,
8 including fees for "incidental and routine work," fees for "long letters sent in form of emails,"
9 fees for "long phone calls," fees for "making contact with nephew," fees for "inflated billing
10 hours (social security)," fees for "back-charging withdrawal fees and costs," fees for
11 "promoting unrealistic financing," fees for "nickle [sic] and diming monthly report charges,"
12 fees for "post-withdrawal charges," fees for "half-day disclosure statement hearing" on
13 August 2, 2018 (LODAT states no such fees were charged on the Fee Application), fees
14 for "double charging for service list", fees for "voicemail messages," fees for "file memos",
15 fees for "discovery during the fee dispute process," fees for "continued hearings," fees for
16 "preparing responses to fee application objections," fees for "delegation of tasks," and fees
17 for "lack of communication after motion to withdraw filed." ECF 127 at 5-17. The court has
18 addressed Debtor's objections to the Fee Application under the lodestar method by
19 considering his objections to specific billing entries as set forth in his pleadings in July
20 2019. The court has considered Debtor's generalized objections as addressed in LODAT's
21 supplemental reply and LODAT's arguments in reply to these generalized objections.
22 However, the court does not make specific rulings on the generalized objections, that is, for
23 example, the court does not pass upon a "nickel and diming objection to monthly report
24 charges." The court has considered the billing entries on the Fee Application and Debtor's
25 specific objections thereto pursuant to its review for reasonableness under the applicable
26 factors under 11 U.S.C. § 330 as set forth herein and made its rulings based on these
27 factors as set forth in the Rulings Spreadsheet.
28

viii. Fees Requested for Remaining Fee Categories

The court has reviewed LODAT's fees claimed on its fee spreadsheet under the remaining fee categories and has made rulings on the billing entries as set forth in the Rulings Spreadsheet. For the most part, the fees in these remaining categories were allowed as Debtor did not make specific objections to the billing entries in these remaining categories and the court in its review did not find that they should be disallowed.

CONCLUSION

8 For the foregoing reasons, the Fee Application of LODAT as amended and
9 supplemented is approved in part and disapproved in part, and professional fees in the
10 amount of \$38,720.00 and expenses in the amount of \$2,798.19 are approved. A separate
11 final order is being filed and entered concurrently herewith.

12 IT IS SO ORDERED.

1

Date: November 1, 2019

Robert Kwan
United States Bankruptcy Judge

EXHIBIT A

RULINGS SPREADSHEET

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N			
1	IN RE KUDRAVE																
2	Case Number 2:17-BK-17577																
3	(All entries case inception through April 30, 2019)																
4																	
5	TYPE	H=hourly, N=no charge, Cost=cost															
6	STAFF	Attorneys: DAT=David A. Tilem, WSY= William Sloan Youkstetter Paralegals: MLM=Malissa L. Murguia, JJF=JoAn J Fidelson, DC=Diana Chau															
7																	
8																	
9	TYPE	YR	MO	DT	MATTER	STAFF	BILLING SUB-CATEGORY			APPLICANT AMOUNT (ECF 138)	TIME SPENT IN APPLICANT SPREADSHEET*	AMOUNTS IN APPLICANT SPREADSHEET	DISALLOWED AMOUNT	FINALLY ALLOWED AMOUNT**			
10																	
11	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	A - Services Not In Any Other Category (Ch. 11 General)			10,293.03	26.20	10,473.03	720.00	9,753.03			
12	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	B - Firm Employment and Compensation			566.55	3.3	646.55	80.00	566.55			
13	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	B01 - Motion to Withdraw			3,060.83	6.50	3,210.83	3,157.23	53.60			
14	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	B02 - Final Fee Application Charges			24,685.45	43.10	21,621.13	20,763.13	858.00			
15	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	B03 - Fee Application Mediation (No Entries Billed as B03)			5,552.47	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00			
16	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	C - U.S. Trustee Matters			9,045.02	29.60	9,725.02	880.00	8,845.02			
17	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	F - Claims			2,945.50	6.80	2,995.50	100.00	2,895.50			
18	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	G - Employment and Compensation of Other Professionals			893.08	3.2	893.08	0.00	893.08			
19	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	M - Use, Sale or Lease of Estate Assets			1,045.17	3.30	1,045.17	80.00	965.17			
20	//	//	//	//	TOTALS	//	T - Plan and Disclosure Statement Services			31,828.24	67.30	31,878.24	15,190.00	16,688.24			
21																	
22					TOTAL	//	SUM TOTALS			89,915.34	189.30	82,488.55	40,970.36	41,518.19			
23																	
24																	
25																	
26							* Certain expenses such as copies, mileage, postage, and parking were included in LODAT's "Time" entries. Those expense entries were revised to zero in the "Time" column in order to provide a summation of hours billed to legal tasks under the lodestar method for each of LODAT's subcategories listed above. The court's revisions to the "Time" column did not otherwise effect the allowance or disallowance of the reasonable fees and expenses at issue.								**The finally allowed amount of \$41,518.19 includes \$38,720.00 in fees and \$2,798.19 in expenses.		

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
1									IN RE KUDRAVE					
2									Case Number 2:17-BK-17577					
3									(All entries case inception through April 30, 2019)					
4														
5	TYPE	H=hourly, N=no charge, Cost=cost												
6	STAFF	Attorneys: DAT=David A. Tilem, WSY= William Sloan Youkstetter Paralegals: MLM=Malissa L. Murguia, JJF=JoAn J Fidelson, DC=Diana Chau												
7														
8														
9	TYPE	YR	MO	DT	MATTER	STAFF			BILLING DESCRIPTION	TIME	RATE	AMOUNT	DISALLOWED AMOUNT	FINALLY ALLOWED AMOUNT
10	H	2017	6	19	03019.01-A	DAT			INITIAL CONVERSATION ABOUT POSSIBLE CHAPTER 11 CASE WITH PETER KUDRAVE.	0.9	500	450.00	0.00	450.00
11	H	2017	6	19	03019.01-A	WSY			REVIEW EMAIL FROM ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING RETAINER LETTER AND REVIEW CASE BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM LETTER.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
12	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	DAT			CONFER WITH PARALEGAL ABOUT PREPARATION OF CHAPTER 11 PETITION.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
13	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	DAT			MEETING WITH CLIENT REGARDING CASE BACKGROUND - GETTING A CASE OFF THE GROUND.	1	500	500.00	0.00	500.00
14	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	DAT			E-MAIL TO CLIENT OUTLINING NEXT STEPS.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
15	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT WITH QUESTIONS ABOUT SCHEDULES I AND J AND PROJECTED BUDGET FOR OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
16	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	MLM			EMAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING PRE-BANKRUPTCY CREDIT COUNSELING.	0.1	150	15.00	0.00	15.00
17	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	MLM			REVIEW CLIENT DOCUMENTS TO DETERMINE IF THERE IS ENOUGH INFORMATION FOR EMERGENCY PETITION.	0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
18	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	JJF			PREPARE PETITION & SCHEDULES.	1	100	100.00	0.00	100.00
19	H	2017	6	20	03019.01-A	JJF			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING MISSING INFORMATION.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
20	H	2017	6	21	03019.01-A	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING UNSECURED DEBTS AND OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO FILING PETITION.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
21	H	2017	6	21	03019.01-A	JJF			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING MISSING INFORMATION.	0.5	100	50.00	0.00	50.00
22	H	2017	6	21	03019.01-A	JJF			CONTINUE PREPARATION OF PETITION & SCHEDULES.	4.5	100	450.00	0.00	450.00
23	H	2017	6	21	03019.01-A	JJF			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING MONTHLY EXPENSES.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
24	H	2017	6	21	03019.01-A	JJF			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING MISSING INFORMATION.	0.4	100	40.00	0.00	40.00
25	COST	2017	6	21	03019.01-A	JJF			CHAPTER 11 EMERGENCY FILING FEE.	0	0	1,717.00	0.00	1,717.00
26	H	2017	6	21	03019.01-A	JJF			FAX TO NBS DEFAULT SERVICES REGARDING NOTICE OF BANKRUPTCY FILING.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
27	H	2017	6	21	03019.01-C	DAT			MEETING WITH CLIENT TO DISCUSS OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE REQUIREMENTS, REPORTING REQUIREMENTS, QUARTERLY FEES AND OTHER MATTERS.	1.5	500	750.00	0.00	750.00
28	H	2017	6	22	03019.01-A	JJF			TELEPHONE CALL TO NBS DEFAULT SERVICES TO CONFIRM RECEIPT OF NOTICE OF BANKRUPTCY FILING.	0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00
29	H	2017	6	22	03019.01-A	WSY			ISSUES WITH THE CASE AND CASE STRATEGIES	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
30	H	2017	6	22	03019.01-B	JJF			PREPARE MOTION TO EMPLOY THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID A. TILEM.	0.8	100	80.00	0.00	80.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
31	H	2017	6	22	03019.01-B	WSY	REVIEW EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EDITS.			0.2	300	60.00	0.00	60.00
32	H	2017	6	22	03019.01-C	JJF	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING INFORMATION NEEDED TO COMPLETE 7-DAY PACKAGE.			0.3	100	30.00	0.00	30.00
33	N	2017	6	22	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW CASE BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM RETAINER LETTER AGAIN TO ASSESS OFFICE OF UNITED STATES TRUSTEE COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>			0.4	300	120.00	120.00	0.00
34	H	2017	6	22	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW FILED PETITION, SCHEDULES, AND STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL AFFAIRS TO ASSESS OFFICE OF UNITED STATES TRUSTEE COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS.			0.5	300	150.00	0.00	150.00
35	N	2017	6	22	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PARALEGAL MURGUIA REGARDING DIVISION OF LABOR FOR OFFICE OF UNITED STATES TRUSTEE COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>			0.3	300	90.00	90.00	0.00
36	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-A	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT WITH CASE STATUS NOTES AND THINGS TO BE DONE.			0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
37	COST	2017	6	23	03019.01-A	MLM	COPIES OF ORDER SETTING STATUS CONFERENCE (57).			0	0.2	11.40	0.00	11.40
38	COST	2017	6	23	03019.01-A	MLM	POSTAGE FOR ORDER SETTING STATUS CONFERENCE.			0	0	8.74	0.00	8.74
39	N	2017	6	23	03019.01-A	WSY	REVIEW EMAIL FROM ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING JUDGE KWAN'S PROCEDURES. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>			0.1	300	30.00	30.00	0.00
40	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-B	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE STATEMENT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
41	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-B	JJF	PREPARE STATEMENT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS.			0.3	100	30.00	0.00	30.00
42	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-B	JJF	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING MOTION TO EMPLOY THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID A. TILEM.			0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00
43	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-B	WSY	REVIEW EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION FINAL DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON.			0.2	300	60.00	0.00	60.00
44	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-C	JJF	START TO PREPARE 7-DAY PACKAGE.			2	100	200.00	0.00	200.00
45	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-C	WSY	DRAFT STATEMENT OF MAJOR ISSUES AND TIMETABLE REPORT.			0.3	300	90.00	0.00	90.00
46	H	2017	6	23	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING STATEMENT OF MAJOR ISSUES AND TIMETABLE REPORT.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
47	N	2017	6	23	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW EMAIL FROM ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING WELLS FARGO'S POLICY TO CLOSE ACCOUNTS DURING BANKRUPTCIES. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>			0.1	300	30.00	30.00	0.00
48	H	2017	6	25	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING PROPOSE DEADLINES FOR THE STATEMENT OF MAJOR ISSUES AND TIMETABLE REPORT.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
49	H	2017	6	25	03019.01-C	WSY	EDIT STATEMENT OF MAJOR ISSUES AND TIMETABLE REPORT AND FINALIZE DRAFT.			0.5	300	150.00	0.00	150.00
50	N	2017	6	26	03019.01-A	DAT	RETURN TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT, NOT IN, LEFT MESSAGE. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
51	H	2017	6	26	03019.01-A	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT STATUS OF GATHERING DOCUMENTS.			0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
52	H		2017	6	26	03019.01-A	JJF	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING INCOME AND EXPENSES.		0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
53	H		2017	6	26	03019.01-C	DAT	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY YOUNGSTETTER REGARDING MAJOR ISSUES AND TIMETABLE REPORT.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
54	H		2017	6	26	03019.01-C	JJF	CONTINUE TO PREPARE UPDATES TO 7-DAY PACKAGE.		2	100	200.00	0.00	200.00
55	N		2017	6	26	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW EMAIL FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING MR. KUDRAVE'S DOCUMENTS AND REVIEW DOCUMENTS ATTACHED TO THE EMAIL. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>		0.1	300	30.00	30.00	0.00
56	H		2017	6	26	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW EMAIL FROM ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING DEBTOR-IN-POSSESSION BANK ACCOUNT AND REVIEW ACCOUNT INFORMATION		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
57	H		2017	6	26	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW COMPLIANCE ATTACHMENTS AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR PARALEGAL FIDELSON.		0.3	300	90.00	0.00	90.00
58	H		2017	6	26	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW COMPLIANCE FIRST DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EDITS.		0.5	300	150.00	0.00	150.00
59	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW DRAFT SCHEDULES I & J. DISCUSS WITH ATTORNEY YOUNGSTETTER AND PARALEGAL FIDELSON.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
60	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-A	DAT	CONFER WITH CLIENT ABOUT SCHEDULE J, SCHEDULE I AND OTHER SCHEDULES INFORMATION.		0.5	500	250.00	0.00	250.00
61	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-A	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING MR. KUDRAVE'S INCOME AND EXPENSES.		0.3	300	90.00	0.00	90.00
62	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-A	WSY	REVIEW SCHEDULES I AND J DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PROVIDE COMMENTS.		0.3	300	90.00	0.00	90.00
63	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	DAT	E-MAIL TO GARY BADDIN REGARDING FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS, INITIAL DEBTOR INTERVIEW, CHAPTER 11 DEBTOR IN POSSESSION ACCOUNTS, MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT PREPARATION AND OTHER ISSUES RELATED TO THE CASE.		0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
64	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	JJF	PREPARE UPDATES TO 7-DAY PACKAGE.		1.5	100	150.00	0.00	150.00
65	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	WSY	DRAFT 90 DAY PROJECTIONS FOR OFFICE OF UNITED STATES TRUSTEE COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS.		1	300	300.00	0.00	300.00
66	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING COMMENTS FOR COMPLIANCE FIRST DRAFT.		0.3	300	90.00	0.00	90.00
67	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON TO DISCUSS HER QUESTIONS REGARDING OFFICE OF UNITED STATES TRUSTEE COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
68	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY TILEM AND PARALEGAL MURGUIA REGARDING INITIAL DEBTOR INTERVIEW SCHEDULING.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
69	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW COMPLIANCE SECOND DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EDITS.		0.4	300	120.00	0.00	120.00
70	H		2017	6	27	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW COMPLIANCE THIRD DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EDITS.		0.2	300	60.00	0.00	60.00
71	H		2017	6	28	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING VARIOUS ENTITIES, ORGANIZATIONS WITH WHICH CLIENT HAS BEEN AFFILIATED.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
72	H		2017	6	28	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING OTHER POTENTIAL RELATED ENTITIES.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
73	H		2017	6	28	03019.01-A	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING POTENTIAL TIMES FOR A MEETING WITH MR. KUDRAVE REGARDING HIS EXPENSES.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
74	N			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING QUARTERLY FEES AND OTHER ISSUES. Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).	0.6	500	300.00	300.00	0.00
75	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM GARY BADDIN REGARDING INITIAL DEBTOR INTERVIEW, QUARTERLY FEES AND REQUIRED CHAPTER 11 DEBTOR IN POSSESSION ACCOUNTS.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
76	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	JJF	PREPARE UPDATES TO 7-DAY PACKAGE.	1.5	100	150.00	0.00	150.00
77	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	JJF	E-MAIL TO US TRUSTEE REGARDING CLIENTS 7-DAY PACKAGE.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
78	N			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW COMPLIANCE FOURTH DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EDITS. Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).	0.2	300	60.00	60.00	0.00
79	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING MY COMMENTS ON COMPLIANCE FOURTH DRAFT.	0.2	300	60.00	0.00	60.00
80	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING LIST OF INSIDERS.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
81	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING MR. KUDRAVE'S INCOME AND EXPENSES.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
82	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW COMPLIANCE FINAL DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND FINALIZE DRAFT FOR ATTORNEY TILEM.	0.5	300	150.00	0.00	150.00
83	H			2017	6	28	03019.01-C	WSY	RELATED ENTITIES.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
84	H			2017	6	29	03019.01-A	WSY	PREPARE FOR PHONE CONFERENCE WITH MR. KUDRAVE BY REVIEWING SCHEDULES AND CLIENT DOCUMENTS.	0.3	300	90.00	0.00	90.00
85	H			2017	6	29	03019.01-A	WSY	PHONE CONFERENCE WITH MR. KUDRAVE REGARDING HIS EXPENSES AND ASSETS.	1	300	300.00	0.00	300.00
86	H			2017	6	29	03019.01-A	WSY	REVIEW UPDATED SCHEDULES I AND J FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EDITS.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
87	COST			2017	6	29	03019.01-B	JJF	COPIES OF MOTION TO EMPLOY THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID A. TILEM AND STATEMENT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS (402).	0	0.2	80.40	0.00	80.40
88	COST			2017	6	29	03019.01-B	JJF	POSTAGE FOR MOTION TO EMPLOY THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID A. TILEM AND STATEMENT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS.	0	0	15.43	0.00	15.43
89	H			2017	6	29	03019.01-C	DAT	CONFER WITH DEBBIE TYRELL ABOUT ACCOUNTING FOR LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE REIMBURSEMENT FUNDS.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
90	H			2017	6	29	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING AVAILABILITY FOR THE SCHEDULED MEETING OF CREDITORS.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
91	H			2017	6	30	03019.01-A	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING MR. KUDRAVE'S EXPENSES.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
92	H			2017	6	30	03019.01-A	JJF	REVIEW AND PREPARE UPDATES TO SCHEDULE I.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
93	H			2017	6	30	03019.01-B	JJF	REVIEW 90 DAY BUDGET.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
94	H			2017	6	30	03019.01-B	JJF	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING EXPENSES.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
95	H			2017	6	30	03019.01-B	JJF	PREPARE UPDATES TO AMENDED SCHEDULES.	0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
96	H			2017	6	30	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL MURGUIA REGARDING COMMENTS FOR BUDGET MOTION.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
97	H			2017	6	30	03019.01-M	WSY	REVIEW BUDGET MOTION DRAFT AND PROVIDE COMMENTS FOR EDITS.	0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
98	H			2017	7	3	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING TIMING, PROCESS, SCHEDULING.	0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
99	H			2017	7	3	03019.01-A	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING HOW CASE IS LIKELY TO PROGRESS AND OTHER ISSUES.	0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
100	H		2017	7	3	03019.01-A	JJF	PREPARE UPDATES TO INCOME AND EXPENSES.		0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
101	H		2017	7	4	03019.01-G	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM APPRAISER GREENE REGARDING HIS EMPLOYMENT ON BEHALF OF THE ESTATE.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
102	N		2017	7	5	03019.01-A	DAT	UPDATE CLIENT'S MAILING ADDRESS IN BILLING SOFTWARE AND TELEPHONE LIST. E-MAIL TO CLIENT ASKING IF HE WANTS US TO FILE CHANGE OF ADDRESS WITH COURT. Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).		0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
103	COST		2017	7	5	03019.01-C	DAT	ATTORNEY SERVICE INVOICE 373070. OBTAIN CERTIFIED COPY OF PETITION FROM COURT CLERK AND DELIVER TO COUNTY RECORDER FOR RECORDING.		0	0	137.82	0.00	137.82
104	H		2017	7	5	03019.01-G	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM APPRAISER REGARDING ENGAGEMENT LETTER.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
105	H		2017	7	5	03019.01-G	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING APPRAISER'S EMPLOYMENT MOTION.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
106	H		2017	7	6	03019.01-C	DAT	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON ABOUT RELATED ENTITIES FOR OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE COMPLIANCE PURPOSES.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
107	H		2017	7	6	03019.01-G	MLM	START PREPARING MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER.		0.3	150	45.00	0.00	45.00
108	H		2017	7	7	03019.01-A	JJF	PREPARE NOTICE OF CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS.		0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
109	H		2017	7	7	03019.01-M	MLM	PREPARE BUDGET MOTION.		0.3	150	45.00	0.00	45.00
110	H		2017	7	10	03019.01-C	JJF	PREPARE UPDATES TO 7-DAY PACKAGE.		0.8	100	80.00	0.00	80.00
111	H		2017	7	10	03019.01-C	JJF	E-MAIL TO OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE REGARDING AMENDMENT TO 7-DAY PACKAGE.		0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00
112	COST		2017	7	11	03019.01-A	JJF	COPIES OF CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS (3).		0	0.2	0.60	0.00	0.60
113	COST		2017	7	11	03019.01-A	JJF	POSTAGE FOR CHANGE OF MAILING ADDRESS.		0	0	0.47	0.00	0.47
114	H		2017	7	11	03019.01-A	JJF	PREPARE UPDATES TO AMENDED SCHEDULES.		0.5	100	50.00	0.00	50.00
115	H		2017	7	11	03019.01-C	JJF	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING MISSING INFORMATION REQUESTED BY ANALYST.		0.3	100	30.00	0.00	30.00
116	H		2017	7	11	03019.01-G	MLM	FINISH PREPARING MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER.		0.3	150	45.00	0.00	45.00
117	COST		2017	7	11	03019.01-M	MLM	COPIES OF BUDGET MOTION (92).		0	0.2	18.40	0.00	18.40
118	COST		2017	7	11	03019.01-M	MLM	POSTAGE FOR BUDGET MOTION.		0	0	9.83	0.00	9.83
119	H		2017	7	11	03019.01-M	MLM	EMAIL CLIENT HIS DECLARATION REGARDING BUDGET MOTION FOR REVIEW AND SIGNATURE.		0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
120	H		2017	7	12	03019.01-G	MLM	EMAIL CLIENT MOTION TO EMPLOY THE APPRAISER FOR HIS REVIEW AND SIGNATURE.		0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
121	H		2017	7	12	03019.01-G	MLM	EMAIL APPRAISER GREENE HIS DECLARATION AND STATEMENT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS FOR REVIEW AND SIGNATURE.		0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
122	COST		2017	7	12	03019.01-G	JJF	COPIES OF MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER AND STATEMENT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS (180).		0	0.2	36.00	0.00	36.00
123	COST		2017	7	12	03019.01-G	JJF	POSTAGE FOR MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER AND STATEMENT OF DISINTERESTEDNESS.		0	0	14.76	0.00	14.76
124	H		2017	7	13	03019.01-C	DAT	REVIEW FILE FOR INITIAL DEBTOR INTERVIEW.		0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
125	H		2017	7	13	03019.01-C	DAT	INITIAL DEBTOR INTERVIEW FOLLOWED BY MEETING WITH CLIENT TO DISCUSS INFORMATION RELATED TO INITIAL DEBTOR INTERVIEW.		4	500	2,000.00	0.00	2,000.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
126	COST	2017	7	13	03019.01-C	DAT	MILEAGE (40).			0	0.56	22.40	0.00	22.40
127	COST	2017	7	13	03019.01-C	DAT	PARKING.			0	0	4.00	0.00	4.00
128	H	2017	7	13	03019.01-F	DAT	RETURN TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT OLD OLDMAN CLAIM WHICH OLDMAN CLAIMS IS STILL OWED AND CLIENT CLAIMS WAS PAID.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
129	H	2017	7	14	03019.01-A	DAT	PREPARATION OF STATUS REPORT.			0.7	500	350.00	0.00	350.00
130	H	2017	7	14	03019.01-A	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING DRAFT STATUS REPORT.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
131	H	2017	7	14	03019.01-C	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING BANK ACCOUNTS AND PREPARING FOR THE FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
132	H	2017	7	18	03019.01-B	JJF	PREPARE AND ASSEMBLE DECLARATION OF NON-OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EMPLOY THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID A. TILEM.			0.3	100	30.00	0.00	30.00
133	COST	2017	7	18	03019.01-B	JJF	COPIES OF DECLARATION OF NON-OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EMPLOY THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID A. TILEM (61).			0	0.2	12.20	0.00	12.20
134	COST	2017	7	18	03019.01-B	JJF	POSTAGE FOR DECLARATION OF NON-OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EMPLOY THE LAW OFFICES OF DAVID A. TILEM.			0	0	4.06	0.00	4.06
135	H	2017	7	18	03019.01-B	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING NO HEARING REQUEST DECLARATION AND ORDER FOR EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
136	H	2017	7	18	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING COMPLIANCE AND PROOFS OF CLAIMS FILED BY CREDITORS.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
137	H	2017	7	18	03019.01-F	DAT	REVIEW CREDIT REPORT.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
138	H	2017	7	18	03019.01-F	WSY	REVIEW PROOF OF CLAIM FILED BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.			0.2	300	60.00	0.00	60.00
139	H	2017	7	18	03019.01-F	WSY	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY TILEM REGARDING PROOF OF CLAIM FILED BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
140	H	2017	7	19	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING FINANCIAL STATEMENTS ISSUED IN CONNECTION WITH MORTGAGE MODIFICATION EFFORT. ISSUED INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARALEGAL TO AMEND STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL AFFAIRS TO REFLECT THESE STATEMENTS.			0.5	500	250.00	0.00	250.00
141	H	2017	7	19	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING WELLS FARGO BANK APPRAISER AND HIS REBUTTAL OF THE SAME.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
142	N	2017	7	19	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING WELLS FARGO APPRAISAL. Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
143	H	2017	7	19	03019.01-C	DAT	E-MAIL TO GARY BADDIN REGARDING FINANCIAL STATEMENTS PROVIDED BY CLIENT TO HARP PROGRAM.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
144	N	2017	7	19	03019.01-C	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING PROVIDING FINANCIAL REPORTS TO OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE. Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
145	H	2017	7	19	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING STATUS OF COMPLIANCE.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
146	H	2017	7	20	03019.01-C	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT ABILITY TO CHANGE FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS DATE AND TIME.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
147	H	2017	7	20	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING STATUS OF COMPLIANCE.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
148	H	2017	7	20	03019.01-F	WSY	REVIEW PROOF OF CLAIM FILED BY FRANCHISE TAX BOARD.			0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
149	H		2017	7	21	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE CASE STATUS REPORT.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
150	COST		2017	7	21	03019.01-A	MLM	COPIES OF STATUS REPORT (45).		0	0.2	9.00	0.00	9.00
151	COST		2017	7	21	03019.01-A	MLM	POSTAGE FOR STATUS REPORT.		0	0	9.41	0.00	9.41
152	H		2017	7	21	03019.01-C	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS SCHEDULE. TELEPHONE CALL TO ATTORNEY LAU REGARDING SAME. NOT IN, LEFT MESSAGE.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
153	H		2017	7	21	03019.01-C	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM ATTORNEY LAU RESPONDING TO MY MESSAGE. CONFIRMED NO CHANGE IN DATE/TIME FOR FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
154	H		2017	7	21	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING STATUS OF COMPLIANCE.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
155	H		2017	7	21	03019.01-C	WSY	REVIEW EMAIL FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING REMAINING COMPLIANCE.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
156	H		2017	7	24	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING HOMEOWNERS INSURANCE DECLARATION.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
157	H		2017	7	25	03019.01-C	DAT	FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS. BRIEF MEETING WITH CLIENT AFTERWARDS.		2.9	500	1,450.00	0.00	1,450.00
158	COST		2017	7	25	03019.01-C	DAT	MILEAGE (30).		0	0.56	16.80	0.00	16.80
159	COST		2017	7	25	03019.01-C	DAT	PARKING.		0	0	4.00	0.00	4.00
160	H		2017	7	26	03019.01-A	DAT	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL ABOUT AMENDMENTS TO SCHEDULES WHICH BECAME APPARENT DURING FIRST MEETING OF CREDITORS.		0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
161	H		2017	7	28	03019.01-F	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING NOTICE OF CONTINUED FORECLOSURE SALE.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
162	H		2017	7	28	03019.01-M	MLM	PREPARE ORDER GRANTING BUDGET MOTION.		0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
163	H		2017	7	28	03019.01-M	MLM	PREPARE DECLARATION NON OPPOSITION REGARDING BUDGET MOTION.		0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
164	COST		2017	7	28	03019.01-M	MLM	COPIES OF DECLARATION OF NON OPPOSITION REGARDING BUDGET MOTION (21).		0	0.2	4.20	0.00	4.20
165	COST		2017	7	28	03019.01-M	MLM	POSTAGE FOR DECLARTAION OF NON OPPOSITION REGARDING BUDGET MOTION.		0	0	1.82	0.00	1.82
166	H		2017	8	1	03019.01-G	JJF	PREPARE AND ASSEMBLE DECLARATION OF NON-OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER AND ORDER.		0.4	100	40.00	0.00	40.00
167	COST		2017	8	1	03019.01-G	JJF	COPIES OF DECLARATION OF NON-OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER AND ORDER (37).		0	0.2	7.40	0.00	7.40
168	COST		2017	8	1	03019.01-G	JJF	POSTAGE FOR DECLARATION OF NON-OPPOSITION TO MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER AND ORDER.		0	0	2.70	0.00	2.70
169	H		2017	8	1	03019.01-G	WSY	REVIEW DECLARATION THAT NO PARTY REQUESTED A HEARING DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING APPLICATION TO EMPLOY REAL ESTATE BROKER		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
170	H		2017	8	1	03019.01-G	WSY	REVIEW ORDER DRAFT FROM PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING APPLICATION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
171	H		2017	8	2	03019.01-C	JJF	E-MAIL TO THE OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE REGARDING CLIENT'S STATUS REGARDING UPDATED INSURANCE POLICY AND SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME ACCOUNT.		0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00
172	H		2017	8	2	03019.01-C	WSY	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL FIDELSON REGARDING DEBTOR IN POSSESSION ACCOUNT AND INSURANCE.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
173	H		2017	8	2	03019.01-G	WSY	REVIEW ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EMPLOY APPRAISER.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
174	H		2017	8	2	03019.01-M	WSY	REVIEW ORDER DENYING BUDGET MOTION.		0.1	300	30.00	0.00	30.00
175	H		2017	8	7	03019.01-B	MLM	PREPARE PROFESSIONAL FEE STATEMENT NO. 1.		0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
176	COST		2017	8	8	03019.01-B	MLM	COPIES OF PROFESSIONAL FEE STATEMENT NO. 1 (19).		0	0.2	3.80	0.00	3.80
177	COST		2017	8	8	03019.01-B	MLM	POSTAGE FOR PROFESSIONAL FEE STATEMENT NO. 1.		0	0	8.74	0.00	8.74
178	H		2017	8	9	03019.01-A	DAT	STATUS CONFERENCE FOLLOWED BY BRIEF MEETING WITH CLIENT ON COURTHOUSE STEPS.		1.7	500	850.00	0.00	850.00
179	COST		2017	8	9	03019.01-A	DAT	MILEAGE (30).		0	0.56	16.80	0.00	16.80
180	COST		2017	8	9	03019.01-A	DAT	PARKING.		0	0	2.00	0.00	2.00
181	H		2017	8	9	03019.01-A	DAT	E-MAIL TO STAFF ABOUT COURT SET DEADLINES, WORK TO BE DONE TO COMPLETE THIS CASE.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
182	H		2017	8	16	03019.01-A	JJF	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING MISSING INFORMATION AND DOCUMENTS NEEDED TO MOVE FORWARD WITH CASE.		0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
183	N		2017	8	17	03019.01-B	JJF	PREPARE NOTICE OF UNAVAILABILITY. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>		0.3	100	30.00	30.00	0.00
184	COST		2017	8	17	03019.01-B	JJF	COPIES OF NOTICE OF UNAVAILABILITY (5).		0	0.2	1.00	0.00	1.00
185	COST		2017	8	17	03019.01-B	JJF	POSTAGE FOR NOTICE OF UNAVAILABILITY.		0	0	0.92	0.00	0.92
186	H		2017	8	18	03019.01-A	MLM	EMAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING INFORMATION NEEDED TO PREPARE ROOF REPAIR MOTION AND MOTION FOR LONGTERM INSURANCE CARE.		0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
187	H		2017	8	29	03019.01-C	JJF	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING REQUIREMENTS FOR CHAPTER 11 DEBTOR IN POSSESSION VOIDED CHECKS.		0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00
188	H		2017	8	30	03019.01-A	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING STATUS OF CASE.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
189	H		2017	9	11	03019.01-F	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CREDITOR GREG CREIGHTON REGARDING PROOF OF CLAIM.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
190	H		2017	9	15	03019.01-A	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING LONGTERM CARE INSURANCE REINSTATEMENT ISSUES.		0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
191	H		2017	9	18	03019.01-C	JJF	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING UPDATED INFORMATION REGARDING CHAPTER 11 DEBTOR IN POSSESSION VOIDED CHECK.		0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
192	H		2017	9	22	03019.01-C	JJF	E-MAIL TO OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE REGARDING UPDATED VEHICLE INSURANCE POLICY.		0.3	100	30.00	0.00	30.00
193	H		2017	10	2	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE STATUS REPORT.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
194	H		2017	10	2	03019.01-A	MLM	PREPARE STATUS REPORT.		0.5	150	75.00	0.00	75.00
195	COST		2017	10	2	03019.01-A	MLM	COPIES OF CASE STATUS REPORT (41).		0	0.2	8.20	0.00	8.20
196	COST		2017	10	2	03019.01-A	MLM	POSTAGE FOR CASE STATUS REPORT.		0	0	9.41	0.00	9.41
197	H		2017	10	2	03019.01-M	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT ABOUT MOTION TO HIRE CONTRACTOR AND REPAIR ROOF.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
198	H		2017	10	3	03019.01-C	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING VOIDED CHECK FOR CHAPTER 11 DEBTOR IN POSSESSION ACCOUNT.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
199	H		2017	10	13	03019.01-A	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING STATUS OF CASE.		0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
200	H	2017	10	17	03019.01-A	DAT			RESEARCH APPLICABILITY OF §365(C)(2) TO LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE. Ruling: Disallowed in part - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain objection of debtor in part, deny in part because debtor made "personal favor request." Excessive time for task. No showing that such work benefitted estate. Allowed time: 0.5 hour.	0.7	500	350.00	100.00	250.00
201	H	2017	10	18	03019.01-A	DAT			CONTINUED RESEARCH REGARDING LONG TERM CARE INSURANCE AS EXECUTORY CONTRACT - FINANCIAL ACCOMMODATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain objection of debtor (also see ruling on preceding entry).	0.3	500	150.00	150.00	0.00
202	H	2017	10	18	03019.01-M	MLM			START PREPARING MOTION TO REPAIR ROOF.	0.4	150	60.00	0.00	60.00
203	H	2017	10	19	03019.01-C	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM DEBBIE TYRELL ABOUT PREPARATION OF SEPTEMBER MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
204	H	2017	10	20	03019.01-M	DAT			REVIEW AND REVISE MOTION TO REPLACE ROOF.	0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
205	H	2017	10	20	03019.01-M	MLM			FINISH PREPARING MOTION TO REPAIR ROOF.	0.3	150	45.00	0.00	45.00
206	H	2017	10	23	03019.01-A	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING UPCOMING STATUS CONFERENCE - NEED TO APPEAR, AND OTHER ISSUES PENDING IN CASE. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (appearance reminder), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate ("other issues" not specified). Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.3	500	150.00	140.00	10.00
207	H	2017	10	23	03019.01-M	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM COURT CLERK ABOUT SCHEDULING ROOF MOTION SHORTLY BEFORE THANKSGIVING - MAY AUTHORIZE SHORT NOTICE TO HAVE MATTER HEARD ON 11/15. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (scheduling hearing). Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
208	COST	2017	10	23	03019.01-M	MLM			COPIES OF MOTION TO REPAIR ROOF (69).	0	0.2	13.80	0.00	13.80
209	COST	2017	10	23	03019.01-M	MLM			POSTAGE FOR ROOF REPAIR MOTION.	0	0	9.62	0.00	9.62
210	H	2017	10	24	03019.01-C	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM DEBBIE TYRELL REGARDING PREPARATION OF MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER, 2017. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed, reasonable amount of time for attorney and paralegal to discuss monthly operating report preparation issue, overrule debtor's objection.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
211	H	2017	10	24	03019.01-C	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING ISSUE RELATED TO PREPARATION OF MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT. CALLED CELL - NO MESSAGE, CALLED BUSINESS NUMBER AND LEFT MESSAGE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, no benefit to estate.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
212	H	2017	10	24	03019.01-C	DAT			E-MAIL TO DEBBIE TYRELL REGARDING PREPARATION OF MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER, 2017. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed, reasonable amount of time for attorney and paralegal to discuss monthly operating report preparation issue, overrule debtor's objection.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
213	H	2017	10	24	03019.01-C	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING PREPARATION OF MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT FOR SEPTEMBER, 2017.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
214	H	2017	10	24	03019.01-C	DAT			EXCHANGE MULTIPLE EMAILS WITH DEBBIE TYRELL REGARDING SEPTEMBER MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed, reasonable amount of time for attorney and paralegal to discuss monthly operating report preparation issue, overrule debtor's objection.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
215	H	2017	10	25	03019.01-A	DAT			REVIEW FILE FOR STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING TODAY.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
216	H	2017	10	25	03019.01-A	DAT			STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING.	0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
217	H	2017	10	25	03019.01-A	DAT			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING RESULTS.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
218	H	2017	10	26	03019.01-F	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING OLMAX PROOF OF CLAIM.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
219	H	2017	10	26	03019.01-F	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING CHECK REGISTER AND PREPARE NOTES ABOUT OBJECTION TO CLAIM.	2.2	500	1,100.00	0.00	1,100.00
220	H	2017	10	26	03019.01-F	DAT			PREPARATION OF ADDITIONAL NOTES ABOUT POSSIBLE OBJECTION TO CLAIM 4.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
221	H	2017	10	26	03019.01-F	DAT			RETURN TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING OLMAX CLAIM NOTES TO FILE REGARDING SAME.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
222	H	2017	10	27	03019.01-F	DAT			INSTRUCT PARALEGAL TO BEGIN PREPARATION OF OBJECTION TO CLAIM 4. PROVIDE SUMMARY OF BASIS FOR OBJECTION.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
223	COST	2017	10	31	03019.01-A	DAT			COURTCALL AT HEARING ON 10/25.	0	0	35.00	0.00	35.00
224	H	2017	10	31	03019.01-F	DAT			CONFER WITH PARALEGAL MURGUIA REGARDING OBJECTION TO CLAIM.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
225	H	2017	10	31	03019.01-F	DAT			REVIEW AND REVISE OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF OLMAX.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
226	H	2017	10	31	03019.01-F	DAT			REVIEW AND REVISE OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF OLMAX. Ruling: Allowed in full - amount of time spent reasonable based on nature of task performed objecting to claim, overrule debtor's objection that entry is duplicative of preceding entry.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
227	H	2017	10	31	03019.01-F	MLM			PREPARE OBJECTION TO CLAIM REGARDING OLMAX CORPORATION.	0.5	150	75.00	0.00	75.00
228	COST	2017	11	1	03019.01-F	MLM			COPIES OF OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF OLMAX (96).	0	0.2	19.20	0.00	19.20
229	COST	2017	11	1	03019.01-F	MLM			POSTAGE FOR OBJECTION TO CLAIM OF OLMAX.	0	0	6.30	0.00	6.30
230	H	2017	11	6	03019.01-C	DAT			E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING AUTOMATIC DEPOSIT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS INTO NEW CHAPTER 11 DEBTOR IN POSSESSION ACCOUNT.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
231	H	2017	11	10	03019.01-C	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING QUARTERLY FEE COMPUTATION.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
232	H	2017	11	10	03019.01-C	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING QUARTERLY FEE AMOUNT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, duplicate of prior entry, sustain objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00
233	H	2017	11	10	03019.01-M	DAT			REVIEW APPRAISAL REPORT PROVIDED BY CLIENT.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
234	H	2017	11	13	03019.01-C	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING QUARTERLY FEE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, duplicate of prior entry, sustain objection of debtor.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
235	N			2017	12	1	03019.01-F	DAT	REVIEW NOTICE OF CONTINUED HEARING ON OBJECTION TO OLMAX CLAIM. Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
236	H			2017	12	1	03019.01-F	MLM	PREPARE AMENDED NOTICE OF HEARING REGARDING OLMAX'S OBJECTION TO CLAIM.	0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
237	H			2017	12	1	03019.01-M	DAT	REVIEW ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO USE ESTATE PROPERTY TO REPAIR ROOF.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
238	H			2017	12	1	03019.01-M	MLM	PREPARE ORDER GRANTING ROOF REPAIR MOTION.	0.3	150	45.00	0.00	45.00
239	H			2017	12	4	03019.01-F	DAT	REVIEW FAX FROM CREDITOR OLTMAN. INSTRUCT PARALEGAL MURGUIA TO FILE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS WITH COURT REGARDING OBJECTION TO CLAIM.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
240	COST			2017	12	6	03019.01-M	DAT	COURTCALL - COURT APPEARANCE BY PHONE. INVOICE 8743443.	0	0	42.50	0.00	42.50
241	H			2017	12	12	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO WELLS FARGO BANK REGARDING POSSIBLE PLAN NEGOTIATIONS. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed in obtaining favorable loan modification, applicant's trial testimony credible regarding need for time to perform task, overrule objection of debtor.	1.1	500	550.00	0.00	550.00
242	H			2017	12	12	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT PLAN NEGOTIATIONS.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
243	H			2017	12	19	03019.01-A	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT STATUS OF CASE.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
244	H			2017	12	19	03019.01-A	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING STATUS OF CASE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, no need for email if discussed status in telephone conversation on same day (see preceding entry), sustain objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00
245	H			2017	12	19	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER REGARDING POSSIBLE PLAN TERMS. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed in obtaining favorable loan modification, applicant's trial testimony credible regarding need for time to perform task, overrule objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
246	H			2017	12	19	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING CLAIMS AND INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE CLAIM.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
247	H			2017	12	19	03019.01-T	DAT	PREPARATION OF PLAN SPREADSHEET WITH ANALYSIS OF CLAIMS AND PLAN TREATMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet). Allowed time: 0.5 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.5	500	250.00	200.00	50.00
248	H			2017	12	21	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING PLAN SPREADSHEET. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (communications with client regarding spreadsheet preparation). Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
249	H			2017	12	21	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING PLAN AND BUDGET.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
250	H			2017	12	26	03019.01-F	DAT	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL MURGUIA REGARDING PREPARATION OF ORDER SUSTAINING OBJECTION TO OLMAX CLAIM.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
251	H			2017	12	26	03019.01-F	MLM	PREPARE ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISALLOW CLAIM OF OLMAX CORP.	0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
252	H			2017	12	26	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT ABOUT PREPARATION OF DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND PLAN.	0.5	500	250.00	0.00	250.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
253	H			2017	12	26	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE LENDER REGARDING PLAN TERMS. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed in obtaining favorable loan modification, applicant's trial testimony credible regarding need for time to perform task, overrule objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
254	H			2017	12	26	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING TELEPHONE CALL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed in obtaining favorable loan modification, applicant's trial testimony credible regarding need for time to perform task, overrule objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
255	H			2017	12	26	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING PROJECTED BUDGETS, PROVISION FOR LEGAL FEES, 2017 TAXES. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, no need for email if discussed status in telephone conversation on same day (see preceding entry), sustain objection of debtor.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
256	H			2017	12	26	03019.01-T	DAT	START PREPARATION OF DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.	1	500	500.00	0.00	500.00
257	H			2017	12	28	03019.01-T	DAT	CONTINUE PREPARATION OF DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.	0.7	500	350.00	0.00	350.00
258	H			2017	12	28	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT ABOUT LOAN NEGOTIATIONS, PLAN TERMS, EVIDENCE OF FEASIBILITY. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed in obtaining favorable loan modification, applicant's trial testimony credible regarding need for time to perform task, overrule objection of debtor.	0.7	500	350.00	0.00	350.00
259	H			2017	12	28	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT FOLLOWING PHONE CONVERSATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, no need for email if discussed status in telephone conversation on same day (see preceding entry), sustain objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00
260	H			2017	12	29	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING HISTORICAL INCOME INFORMATION. PREPARE SPREADSHEET AND FORECAST MODEL. REVIEW OLMAN PROOF OF CLAIM AND COMPUTE CLAIM TREATMENT FOR OLMAN CLAIM. REVIEW AVAILABLE DATA REGARDING OTHER CLAIMS. E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING MISSING INFORMATION NEEDED TO PREPARE PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lumping of multiple services in one billing entry, excessive time for task (sufficient time already allowed for preparing spreadsheet), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.7 hour @ \$500.00/hour.	1.7	500	850.00	500.00	350.00
261	H			2017	12	29	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING HISTORICAL INCOME, PROJECTED EXPENSES AND PLAN PREFERENCES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lumping of multiple services in one billing entry, lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing schedules), excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.3 hour @ \$100.00/hour	0.4	500	200.00	170.00	30.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
262	H	2017	12	30	03019.01-T	DAT			PREPARATION OF CHAPTER 11 PLAN, PLAN ATTACHMENT, PLAN SPREADSHEET. SEND E-MAIL TO CLIENT ATTACHING ALL 3 DOCUMENTS WITH INSTRUCTIONS FOR THEIR USE. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lumping of multiple services in one billing entry, lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task, ample time has been allowed for preparation of form plan, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 2.0 hours @ \$500.00/hour, 4.3 hours @\$100.00 hour.	6.3	500	3,150.00	1,720.00	1,430.00
263	H	2018	1	1	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT PLAN SPREADSHEET. WORK THROUGH SPREADSHEET WITH CLIENT LINE BY LINE. DISCUSS NEED FOR TAX PROFESSIONAL, RECONVEYANCES OF TRUST DEEDS TO FAMILY, TITLE REPORT ON RESIDENCE, TAX CLAIMS, GENERAL UNSECURED CLAIMS, PLAN FEASIBILITY ISSUES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task performed (conference), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, lumping of multiple services in one billing entry, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.5 hour @ \$500.00/hour and 1.5 hours @\$100.00/hour	2	500	1,000.00	600.00	400.00
264	H	2018	1	2	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL TO ACCOUNTANTS STEFAN TAIIB, APRIL GORDON, DARRL SILVERSPARRE, MICHAEL SALTSMAN. REFERRED ALL TO CLIENT TO GET TAX RETURNS DONE ON URGENT BASIS. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain objection of debtor.	0.8	500	400.00	400.00	0.00
265	H	2018	1	2	03019.01-T	DAT			E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE LENDER REGARDING POSSIBLE PLAN TERMS. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed in obtaining favorable loan modification, applicant's trial testimony credible regarding need for time to perform task, overrule objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
266	H	2018	1	2	03019.01-T	DAT			RETURN TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING BANK STATEMENTS AND LOCATING SUITABLE ACCOUNTANT.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
267	H	2018	1	3	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING UPDATED INFORMATION NEEDED FOR PREPARATION OF PLAN. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task performed (conference), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour	0.3	500	150.00	130.00	20.00
268	H	2018	1	3	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING TITLE REPORT AND LIEN RECONVEYANCES.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
269	H	2018	1	3	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW DOCUMENTS PROVIDED BY CLIENT (INCOME SUMMARY 2013-2017 AND 2017 BANK STATEMENTS FOR WELLS FARGO ACCOUNT). PREPARE SPREADSHEET OF INCOME FROM CLIENT'S CHART. COMPARE 2017 INCOME FROM MONTHLY OPERATING REPORTS TO 2013 SHOWN ON CLIENT'S CHART. E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING SAME. ATTEMPT TO LOCATE SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION AND SEND E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING SAME. LOCATE CASH WITHDRAWALS SHOWN ON STATEMENTS AND SEND E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING SAME. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task performed (conference), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.7 hour @ \$100.00/hour.	0.7	500	350.00	280.00	70.00
270	H	2018	1	3	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW REAL PROPERTY REPORT AND SEND E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING RECORDED ENCUMBRANCES.	0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
271	H	2018	1	3	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING EMAILS I SENT ABOUT BANK STATEMENTS. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task performed (conference), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @ \$100.00/hour	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
272	H	2018	1	4	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW PLAN SPREADSHEET AND SEND E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING PLAN TERMS. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, excessive time for task, sufficient time previously allowed for task, sustain objection of debtor.	0.4	500	200.00	200.00	0.00
273	H	2018	1	4	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM ACCOUNTANT ABOUT MEETING WITH CLIENT, PREPARATION OF TAX RETURNS, REQUEST FOR INFORMATION, DEADLINES AND OTHER INFORMATION NEEDED TO BE EXCHANGED. Ruling: Disallowed in part - excessive time for task, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.2 hour.	0.4	500	200.00	100.00	100.00
274	H	2018	1	4	03019.01-T	DAT			E-MAIL TO ACCOUNTANT AND CLIENT WITH INFORMATION POSSIBLY USABLE BY ACCOUNTANT IN PREPARING RETURNS. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (communications with debtor and accountants regarding data to prepare tax returns), excessive time for task performed, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @ \$100.00/hour	0.3	500	150.00	130.00	20.00
275	H	2018	1	4	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT WITH SUMMARY OF CONVERSATION WITH ACCOUNTANT.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
276	H	2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR LENDER. CALCULATE PROJECTED LOAN PAYMENTS AND REPLY WITH COPY TO CLIENT.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
277	H	2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING OPTIONS LEFT AFTER EMAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR LENDER.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
278	H	2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT			FOLLOW UP EMAIL TO CLIENT AND FOLLOW UP EMAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER ABOUT REAMORTIZATION OVER 40 YEAR TERM.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
279	H		2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT	FURTHER EMAIL EXCHANGE WITH ATTORNEY FOR LENDER REGARDING PLAN TERMS RELATED TO MORTGAGE.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
280	H		2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT MORTGAGE ISSUE, TAX RETURNS. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed, overrule objection of debtor.		0.5	500	250.00	0.00	250.00
281	H		2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT WITH UPDATED SPREADSHEET AND OTHER PLAN RELATED INFORMATION. Ruling: Disallowed in part - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part and overrule in part debtor's objection. Adequate time has already been allowed for simple plan and spreadsheet. Allowed time: 0.5 hour.		1.2	500	600.00	350.00	250.00
282	H		2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING PLAN BUDGET.		0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
283	H		2018	1	8	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE PLAN BUDGET PER COPIES OF SOCIAL SECURITY STATEMENTS PROVIDED BY CLIENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.		0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
284	H		2018	1	10	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW CLIENT HANDWRITTEN RESPONSES TO ISSUES RAISED BY EMAIL AND REPLY.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
285	H		2018	1	10	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING NARRATIVE FOR USE IN DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
286	H		2018	1	11	03019.01-T	DAT	INITIAL REVIEW OF 2015, 2016, 2017 TAX RETURNS.		0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
287	H		2018	1	11	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ACCOUNTANT REGARDING SAME.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
288	H		2018	1	12	03019.01-G	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ACCOUNTANT REGARDING EMPLOYMENT MOTION.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
289	H		2018	1	12	03019.01-G	DAT	REVIEW ENGAGEMENT LETTER FROM ACCOUNTANT AND FORWARD TO PARALEGAL MURGUIA WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO PREPARE EMPLOYMENT MOTION.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
290	H		2018	1	12	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE PLAN SPREADSHEET TO INCLUDE TAX INFORMATION. E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING SAME. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task performed (conference), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.7 hour @\$100.00/hour.		1.1	500	550.00	480.00	70.00
291	H		2018	1	12	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING PLAN SPREADSHEET. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task performed (conference), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.3 hour @\$100.00/hour.		0.7	500	350.00	320.00	30.00
292	H		2018	1	15	03019.01-G	MLM	PREPARE MOTION TO EMPLOY ACCOUNTANT.		0.3	150	45.00	0.00	45.00
293	H		2018	1	15	03019.01-T	DAT	START PREPARATION OF DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, adequate time has already been allowed for simple form plan, spreadsheet and form disclosure statement, including 1.7 hours on 12/26/18 and 12/28/18 for starting and continuing preparation of disclosure statement. Sustain debtor's objection.		1.4	500	700.00	700.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
294	H		2018	1	15	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT INFORMATION NEEDED FOR PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.		0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
295	H							TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT TO REVIEW PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. CLIENT ADVISES THAT TAX RETURNS ARE STILL NOT FINAL. CALL TERMINATED. Ruling: Disallowed in part - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part and overrule in part debtor's objection. Adequate time has already been allowed for preparing disclosure statement for simple plan and spreadsheet and consultation with client. Allowed time: 1.0 hour.		2.5	500	1,250.00	750.00	500.00
296	H		2018	1	15	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ACCOUNTANT TO DISCUSS BIFURCATED TAX YEAR, HOME OFFICE DEDUCTION, ETC.		0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
297	H		2018	1	15	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING BIFURCATED TAX YEAR.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
298	H		2018	1	16	03019.01-G	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM ACCOUNTANT REGARDING MOTION TO EMPLOY.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
299	H		2018	1	16	03019.01-G	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING MOTION TO EMPLOY ACCOUNTANT.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
300	COST		2018	1	16	03019.01-G	JJF	COPIES OF MOTION TO EMPLOY ACCOUNTANT (162).		0	0.2	32.40	0.00	32.40
301	COST		2018	1	16	03019.01-G	JJF	POSTAGE FOR MOTION TO EMPLOY ACCOUNTANT.		0	0	14.82	0.00	14.82
302	H		2018	1	17	03019.01-F	MLM	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING HIS DECISION TO FILE OBJECTION TO CLAIM REGARDING AMERICAN EXPRESS.		0.1	150	15.00	0.00	15.00
303	H		2018	1	17	03019.01-T	DAT	PREPARATION OF CLAIMS CHART WHICH INCLUDES INFORMATION FROM TITLE REPORT, SCHEDULES AND FILED PROOFS OF CLAIM. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing claims chart), sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.9 hour @\$100.00 hour.		0.9	500	450.00	360.00	90.00
304	H		2018	1	17	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT WITH CLAIMS SCHEDULE AND OTHER INFORMATION RELATED TO PREPARATION OF PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for task performed, sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.3 hour @\$100.00 hour.		0.5	500	250.00	220.00	30.00
305	H		2018	1	19	03019.01-F	DAT	REVIEW DEED OF TRUST RECONVEYANCES FOR GRANT, DAVID AND OTHERS.		0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
306	H		2018	1	19	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW UPDATED TAX RETURNS FOR 2015, 2016 AND COMPARE WITH EARLIER DRAFTS. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity of task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, since preparing tax returns was function of accountant, not attorney.		0.5	500	250.00	250.00	0.00
307	H		2018	1	19	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ACCOUNTANT WITH A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT REVISED RETURNS.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
308	H		2018	1	19	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING STATUS OF INFORMATION NEEDED FOR PREPARATION OF PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (communications to request information from client), excessive time for nature of task. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.		0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
309	H		2018	1	19	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ACCOUNTANT ABOUT 2015-2017 TAX RETURNS.		0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
310	H		2018	1	19		03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING 2017 PROPOSED RETURN.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
311	H		2018	1	19		03019.01-T	DAT	UPDATE SPREADSHEET WITH TAX INFORMATION BASED ON UPDATED RETURNS. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00.	0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
312	H		2018	1	24		03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING INFORMATON NEEDED TO PREPARE PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (communications to request information from client), excessive time for nature of task. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.3	500	150.00	140.00	10.00
313	H		2018	1	24		03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT TAX RETURNS AND GETTING THEM FINALIZED.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
314	H		2018	1	25		03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING TAX RETURNS. CONFIRM WITH ACCOUNTANT AND ADVISE CLIENT THAT I WILL BE WORKING ON DISCLOSURE STATEMENT TOMORROW.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
315	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING PLAN AND POSSIBLE CLAIMS OBJECTIONS.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
316	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	PREPARATION OF CHAPTER 11 PLAN AND PLAN ATTACHMENT. . Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, adequate time has already been allowed for simple form plan, spreadsheet and form disclosure statement. Sustain debtor's objection.	1.6	500	800.00	800.00	0.00
317	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	CONTINUE PREPARATION OF DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, adequate time has already been allowed for simple form plan, spreadsheet and form disclosure statement. Sustain debtor's objection.	1.8	500	900.00	900.00	0.00
318	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	PREPARATION OF ATTACHMENTS TO DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.5 hour @\$100.00.	0.5	500	250.00	200.00	50.00
319	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ISSUES.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
320	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ACCOUNTANT REGARDING CASH FLOW PROJECTIONS.	0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
321	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE PLAN SPREADSHEET TO REFLECT COMMENTS FROM ACCOUNTANT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for nature of task. Allowed time: 0.5 hour @\$100.00/hour. Sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection.	0.8	500	400.00	350.00	50.00
322	H		2018	1	26		03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT ABOUT REVISED SPREADSHEET. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (communications with client regarding spreadsheet preparation), excessive time for nature of task. Allowed time: 0.1. hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.3	500	150.00	140.00	10.00
323	H		2018	1	27		03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE PLAN AND PLAN ATTACHMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, adequate time has already been allowed for simple plan, spreadsheet and disclosure statement. Sustain debtor's objection.	0.7	500	350.00	350.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
324	H	2018	1	27	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW AND REVISE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT INCLUDING ADDITION OF ADDENDUM, EXHIBIT STRUCTURE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, adequate time has already been allowed for simple plan, spreadsheet and disclosure statement. Sustain debtor's objection.	0.9	500	450.00	450.00	0.00
325	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			CONFER WITH PARALEGAL ABOUT STATUS OF PREPARING PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
326	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW AND REVISE CHART OF CLAIMS - EXHIBIT C" TO DISCLOSURE STATEMENT." Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for nature of task. Allowed time: 0.4 hour @\$100.00/hour. Sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection.	0.4	500	200.00	160.00	40.00
327	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT ABOUT FIGURES CONTAINED IN MOST RECENT SPREADSHEET. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing spreadsheet), excessive time for task performed (conference), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
328	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM ACCOUNTANT REGARDING SOCIAL SECURITY FIGURES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (communications with accountant regarding spreadsheet preparation), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour. Sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection.	0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
329	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			PREPARATION OF SPREADSHEET REFLECTING SOCIAL SECURITY INCOME INFORMATION. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing schedules), excessive time for nature of task. Sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
330	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING REVISED AND CORRECTED SOCIAL SECURITY INFORMATION. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing budget schedule), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
331	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING CHANGES TO BUDGET FIGURES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing budget schedule), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
332	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			REVISE BUDGET WITH NEW FIGURES PROVIDED BY CLIENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing budget schedule). Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour. Sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
333	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING REVISED BUDGET FIGURES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (preparing budget schedule), lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain in part, overrule in part objection of debtor. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.2	500	100.00	90.00	10.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
334	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT TO ADVISE HIM TO PLEASE CHECK EMAIL. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for nature of task. Sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
335	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ACCOUNTANT TROY REQUESTING COPIES OF FINAL "TAX RETURNS." Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for nature of task. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.3	500	150.00	140.00	10.00
336	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING RECEIPT OF FINAL FIGURES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
337	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	PREPARATION OF FINAL REVISED VERSION OF PLAN SPREADSHEET WITH NEW TAX FIGURES AND REVISED EXPENSE FIGURES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for task performed, sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.4 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.8	500	400.00	360.00	40.00
338	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	FORWARD REVISED FINAL VERSION OF PLAN SPREADSHEET TO CLIENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task. Allowed time: 0.1 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
339	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	PREPARATION OF REVISED FINAL VERSION OF PLAN BASED ON NEW SPREADSHEET FIGURES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (updating figures in plan attachment), no showing that new figures materially changed from plan, sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
340	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	PREPARATION OF REVISED FINAL VERSION OF PLAN INSERTS BASED ON NEW FIGURES IN PLAN SPREADSHEET. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, sustain in part, overrule in part debtor's objection. Allowed time: 0.4 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.4	500	200.00	160.00	40.00
341	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE COMPUTATION OF CHAPTER 7 TRUSTEE HYPOTHETICAL FEE. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for nature of task. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.2	500	100.00	80.00	20.00
342	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE FINAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENT. Ruling: Allowed in full - time allowed for review and revision of disclosure statement reasonable. Overrule debtor's objection.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
343	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE FINAL VERSION OF DISCLOSURE STATEMENT INSERTS. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for nature of task for simple disclosure statement. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.4	500	200.00	180.00	20.00
344	H			2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT TO ADVISE THAT ALL DOCUMENTS HAVE BEEN SENT FOR HIS REVIEW. ANSWER QUESTIONS, PROVIDE INSTRUCTIONS FOR FINALIZATION OF DOCUMENTS. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for nature of task for simple disclosure statement, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate. Allowed time: 0.2 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.3	500	150.00	130.00	20.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
345	H	2018	1	29	03019.01-T	DAT			ASSEMBLE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT AND EXHIBITS - REVIEWING EXHIBITS FOR ACCURACY AS THEY ARE ADDED TO THE DOCUMENT. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task, excessive time for nature of task, lack of necessity of task since attorney already reviewed and revised disclosure statement on same date. Allowed time: 0.6 hour @\$100.00/hour.	0.6	500	300.00	240.00	60.00
346	H	2018	1	30	03019.01-T	DAT			CONFER WITH PARALEGAL MURGUIA REGARDING STATUS OF PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
347	H	2018	1	30	03019.01-T	MLM			PREPARE MOTION TO APPROVE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.	0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
348	H	2018	1	31	03019.01-A	DAT			STATUS CONFERENCE - TELEPHONIC APPEARANCE.	0.5	500	250.00	0.00	250.00
349	H	2018	1	31	03019.01-A	DAT			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING RESULTS OF STATUS CONFERENCE HEARING.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
350	COST	2018	1	31	03019.01-A	DAT			COURTCALL FOR STATUS CONFERENCE.	0	0	35.00	0.00	35.00
351	COST	2018	1	31	03019.01-T	MLM			COPIES OF DISCLOSURE STATEMENT, PLAN AND MOTION TO APPROVE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT (150).	0	0.2	30.00	0.00	30.00
352	COST	2018	1	31	03019.01-T	MLM			POSTAGE FOR DISCLOSURE STATEMENT, PLAN AND MOTION TO APPROVE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.	0	0	14.45	0.00	14.45
353	H	2018	2	5	03019.01-G	MLM			PREPARE DECLARATION OF NON-OPPOSITION REGARDING MOTION TO EMPLOY ACCOUNTANT.	0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
354	H	2018	2	5	03019.01-G	MLM			PREPARE ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EMPLOY ACCOUNTANT.	0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
355	H	2018	2	9	03019.01-A	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT ALTERNATIVES IF PLAN REJECTED BY LENDER.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
356	H	2018	2	12	03019.01-G	DAT			REVIEW ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO EMPLOY ACCOUNTANT. FORWARD COPY TO ACCOUNTANT AND CLIENT.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
357	H	2018	2	13	03019.01-C	DAT			E-MAIL TO DEBBIE TYRELL ABOUT CHANGES TO MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT BASED ON RECONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN TRUST DEEDS.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
358	H	2018	2	13	03019.01-C	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM DEBBIE TYRELL ABOUT PROPOSED CHANGES TO MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed, reasonable amount of time for attorney and paralegal to discuss monthly operating report preparation issue, overrule debtor's objection.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
359	H	2018	2	14	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE HOLDER.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
360	H	2018	2	15	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW OBJECTION TO PLAN FILED BY MORTGAGE LENDER.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
361	H	2018	3	1	03019.01-F	DAT			REVIEW PROOF OF CLAIM AMENDMENT FILED BY INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
362	H	2018	3	1	03019.01-F	DAT			E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING AMENDED INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE PROOF OF CLAIM AND NEED TO TWEAK PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT ACCORDINGLY.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
363	H	2018	3	1	03019.01-T	DAT			E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE LENDER REGARDING STATUS OF COUNTER-OFFER ON PLAN.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
364	H	2018	3	1	03019.01-T	DAT			REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR LENDER. CALCULATE PROJECTED LOAN PAYMENTS AND REPLY WITH COPY TO CLIENT.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
365	N	2018	3	6	03019.01-T	DAT			TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT, LEFT MESSAGE WITH STAFF. Ruling: Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
366	H			2018	3	7	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT, RETURNING HIS FROM LAST WEEK. VOICEMAIL. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, no benefit to estate, fees allowed for actual communication with client in subsequent entry.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
367	H			2018	3	7	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING LOAN NEGOTIATIONS.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
368	H			2018	3	7	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE LENDER REGARDING POSSIBLE SETTLEMENT ALTERNATIVES.	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
369	H			2018	3	7	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER (AS HE REQUESTED) REGARDING TARGET PAYMENT AMOUNT AND SETTLEMENT OPTIONS.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
370	H			2018	3	7	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING POSSIBLE REVERSE MORTGAGE OPTION. Ruling: Allowed in full - reasonable time for task performed - applicant's trial testimony credible as to payment options, overruling objection of debtor.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
371	H			2018	3	7	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE LENDER.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
372	H			2018	3	8	03019.01-F	DAT	REVIEW PROOF OF CLAIM FILED BY FRANCHISE TAX BOARD AND ADVISE CLIENT ACCORDINGLY.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
373	COST			2018	3	12	03019.01-T	JJF	COPIES OF RESPONSE TO WELLS FARGO OBJECTION (6).	0	0.2	1.20	0.00	1.20
374	COST			2018	3	12	03019.01-T	JJF	POSTAGE FOR RESPONSE TO WELLS FARGO OBJECTION.	0	0	0.47	0.00	0.47
375	H			2018	3	15	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR LENDER, FORWARD TO CLIENT FOR CONSIDERATION. UPDATE FILE NOTES AND ISSUE INSTRUCTIONS TO PARALEGAL.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
376	H			2018	3	15	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT ABOUT EMAIL FROM LENDER'S ATTORNEY.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
377	H			2018	3	18	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS WITH ATTORNEY FOR WELLS FARGO BANK.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
378	H			2018	3	18	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR WELLS FARGO BANK CLARIFYING EARLIER EMAIL REGARDING SETTLEMENT NEGOTIATIONS.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
379	H			2018	3	19	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE LENDER.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
380	H			2018	3	19	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR LENDER AND ISSUE INSTRUCTIONS TO PARALEGAL TO CALL CLIENT AND ADVISE.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
381	H			2018	3	19	03019.01-T	DAT	MEMO TO FILE REGARDING SETTLEMENT TERMS. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity, lack of demonstrated benefit to estate, sustain objection of debtor.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
382	H			2018	3	19	03019.01-T	DAT	FURTHER EMAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER TO CLARIFY SETTLEMENT TERM.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
383	H			2018	3	20	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW COURT TENTATIVE REGARDING DISCLOSURE STATEMENT WITH PLAN AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT - ASSESS ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED AND SEND E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING SAME.	0.5	500	250.00	0.00	250.00
384	H			2018	3	20	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING DATE, TIME, PLACE FOR DISCLOSURE STATEMENT HEARING.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
385	COST			2018	3	20	03019.01-T	DAT	COPIES OF DOCUMENTS NEEDED FOR HEARING (65).	0	0.2	13.00	0.00	13.00
386	H			2018	3	20	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW FILE TO PREPARE FOR HEARING.	0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
387	H	2018	3	21	03019.01-T	DAT	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT HEARING AND CONFER WITH CLIENT AFTER HEARING.			1.5	500	750.00	0.00	750.00
388	COST	2018	3	21	03019.01-T	DAT	MILEAGE (30).			0	0.56	16.80	0.00	16.80
389	H	2018	3	21	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER REGARDING STATUS OF CASE, PENDING SETTLEMENT REGARDING PLAN TREATMENT OF MORTGAGE.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
390	H	2018	3	22	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FOR MORTGAGE LENDER. REPLY BOTH TO CLIENT AND TO ATTORNEY.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
391	H	2018	3	30	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
392	H	2018	4	9	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING SETTLEMENT STIPULATION PROPOSED BY BANK COUNSEL. VOICEMAIL. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, no benefit to estate, fees allowed for actual communication with client on 4/10/19.			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
393	H	2018	4	10	03019.01-T	DAT	RETURN TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT, VOICEMAIL. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, no benefit to estate, fees allowed for actual communication with client on later entries on 4/10/19.			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
394	H	2018	4	10	03019.01-T	DAT	RETURN TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT. VOICEMAIL. Ruling: Disallowed in full - excessive time for task, no benefit to estate, fees allowed for actual communication with client on later entries on 4/10/19			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
395	H	2018	4	10	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING STIPULATION REGARDING PLAN.			0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
396	H	2018	4	10	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR LENDER REGARDING SETTLEMENT STIPULATION.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
397	H	2018	4	10	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT REGARDING INCREASE IN MONTHLY PAYMENT DUE TO CORRECTION IN PRINCIPAL BALANCE OF LOAN. RUN CALCULATIONS ON BOTH FIGURES AND RUN ADDITIONAL CALCULATION ON DIFFERENTIAL.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
398	H	2018	4	17	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING SETTLEMENT WITH WELLS FARGO.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
399	H	2018	4	17	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR WELLS FARGO REGARDING SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
400	H	2018	4	17	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT ONE FINAL TIME.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
401	H	2018	4	17	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT TO CONFIRM HIS RECEIPT OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT AND APPROVAL OF SAME.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
402	H	2018	4	18	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM CLIENT WITH COPY OF SIGNED SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT WITH BANK ATTACHED.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
403	H	2018	4	18	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT PROVIDING EXPLANATIONS FOR CERTAIN PARAGRAPHS IN THE AGREEMENT.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
404	H	2018	4	18	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY EXNOWSKI REGARDING PLAN STIPULATION.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
405	H	2018	4	25	03019.01-T	DAT	DISCLOSURE STATEMENT HEARING. Ruling: Disallowed in part - excessive time for task performed (counsel could appear by telephone, hearing lasted 8 minutes, concluded at 11:35 am on 11:00 am calendar, disclosure statement was uncontested after reaching settlement with senior home lender). Allowed time: 1.0 hour.			2	500	1,000.00	500.00	500.00
406	H	2018	4	25	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT REGARDING DISCLOSURE STATEMENT HEARING OUTCOME.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
407	COST	2018	4	25	03019.01-T	DAT	MILEAGE (30).			0	0.56	16.80	0.00	16.80
408	COST	2018	4	25	03019.01-T	DAT	PARKING.			0	0	2.00	0.00	2.00
409	H	2018	4	26	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE ORDER APPROVING DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
410	H	2018	4	26	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE PLAN.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
411	H	2018	4	26	03019.01-T	MLM	REVISE PLAN OF REORGANIZATION TO INSERT INFORMATION REGARDING TREATMENT OF WELLS FARGO BANK.			0.4	150	60.00	0.00	60.00
412	H	2018	4	26	03019.01-T	MLM	PREPARE ORDER APPROVING DISCLOSURE STATEMENT.			0.4	150	60.00	0.00	60.00
413	H	2018	4	30	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING AMENDED PLAN. ASK PARALEGAL CHAU TO FOLLOW UP WITH CLIENT.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
414	H	2018	4	30	03019.01-T	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING AMENDMED PLAN AND AMEX CLAIM.			0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
415	H	2018	5	7	03019.01-C	DAT	E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY FARRIS AT OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE REGARDING PAYMENT OF QUARTERLY FEES. FORWARD TO CLIENT AND TO MONTHLY OPERATING REPORT PREPARER.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
416	COST	2018	5	7	03019.01-T	MLM	COPIES OF PLAN VOTING PACKET (480).			0	0.2	96.00	0.00	96.00
417	COST	2018	5	7	03019.01-T	MLM	POSTAGE FOR PLAN VOTING PACKET.			0	0	39.12	0.00	39.12
418	H	2018	5	18	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY FOR SECURED CREDITOR REGARDING BALLOT.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
419	H	2018	5	18	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING GATHERING VOTES.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
420	H	2018	5	21	03019.01-T	DAT	CONTINUE PREPARATION OF CONFIRMATION BRIEF.			1.1	500	550.00	0.00	550.00
421	H	2018	5	21	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING CONFIRMATION BRIEF.			0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
422	H	2018	5	25	03019.01-F	DAT	3 ATTEMPTS TO RETURN TELEPHONE CALL FROM JACOB" AT FAY LOAN SERVICING 312-429-2623. VOICEMAIL." Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity of task, excessive time for task, no benefit to estate.			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
423	H	2018	6	1	03019.01-A	DAT	REVIEW REQUEST FOR NOTICE FILED BY ATTORNEY EDWARD TREDER. UNABLE TO ASCERTAIN PURPOSE FOR NOTICE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task, no benefit to estate.			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
424	H	2018	6	12	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE MOTION TO APPROVE PLAN.			0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
425	H	2018	6	12	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING CONFIRMATION BRIEF.			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
426	H	2018	6	15	03019.01-T	DAT	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL REGARDING PREPARATION OF CONFIRMATION BRIEF. Ruling: Disallowed in part - excessive time for nature of task to instruct paralegal to prepare table of contents and table of authorities (see following entry). Allowed time: 0.2 hours.			0.5	500	250.00	150.00	100.00
427	H	2018	6	15	03019.01-T	DLC	PREPARE TABLE OF CONTENTS AND TABLE OF AUTHORITIES. Ruling: Disallowed in part - excessive time for nature of task for paralegal to prepare table of contents and table of authorities which could be computer generated. Allowed time: 1.0 hour @ \$100.00/hour.			3.3	100	330.00	230.00	100.00
428	H	2018	6	15	03019.01-T	DLC	PREPARE BALLOT SUMMARY.			0.5	100	50.00	0.00	50.00
429	H	2018	6	15	03019.01-T	DLC	E-MAIL CLIENT DECLARATION TO CLIENT.			0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00
430	H	2018	6	18	03019.01-A	JJF	PREPARE AUTHORIZATION LETTER FOR NEW MORTGAGE LENDER, FAY SERVICING LLC.			0.2	100	20.00	0.00	20.00
431	H	2018	6	18	03019.01-A	JJF	E-MAIL TO MR. BLACKBURN REGARDING AUTHORIZATION FOR CLIENT TO SPEAK TO FAY SERVICING DIRECTLY REGARDING MORTGAGE LOAN.			0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
432	H	2018	6	22	03019.01-A	DLC	TELEPHONE CALL WITH MARK BLOOMFIELD OF FAY SERVICING LLC REGARDING AUTHORIZATION LETTER.		0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00	
433	H	2018	6	22	03019.01-A	DLC	E-MAIL TO FAY SERVICING LLC REGARDING AUTHORIZATION LETTER.		0.1	100	10.00	0.00	10.00	
434	H	2018	6	22	03019.01-B01	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO CLIENT TERMINATING REPRESENTATION. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of client termination benefits applicant, not estate.</i>		0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00	
435	H	2018	6	22	03019.01-B01	DAT	E-MAIL TO CLIENT TO CONFIRM TERMINATION OF ATTORNEY/CLIENT RELATIONSHIP. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of client termination benefits applicant, not estate.</i>		0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00	
436	H	2018	6	22	03019.01-B01	DAT	PREPARATION OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate.</i>		1.7	500	850.00	850.00	0.00	
437	COST	2018	6	25	03019.01-B01	DLC	COPIES (46) OF APPLICATION FOR ORDER SETTING HEARING ON SHORTENED NOTICE. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate.</i>		0	0.2	9.20	9.20	0.00	
438	COST	2018	6	25	03019.01-B01	DLC	COPIES OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL TO DEBTOR-IN-POSSESSION AND CONTINUING THE HEARING ON HEARING TO CONFIRM DEBTOR'S PROPOSED PLAN OF REORGANIZATION (50).		0	0.2	10.00	0.00	10.00	
439	H	2018	6	26	03019.01-B01	DAT	REVIEW ORDER SHORTENING TIME. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate.</i>		0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00	
440	H	2018	6	26	03019.01-B01	DAT	PREPARATION OF INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARALEGAL INCLUDING GATHERING AVAILABLE PHONE, EMAIL AND STREET ADDRESS INFORMATION. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation.</i>		0.6	500	300.00	300.00	0.00	
441	N	2018	6	26	03019.01-B01	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM ATTORNEY KROPPF REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW. <i>Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).</i>		0.3	500	150.00	150.00	0.00	
442	H	2018	6	27	03019.01-B01	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM CLIENT REGARDING FEE DISPUTE. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.</i>		0.6	500	300.00	300.00	0.00	
443	COST	2018	6	27	03019.01-B01	JJF	COPIES OF MOTION TO WITHDRAW (336), NOTICE OF HEARING REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW, & ORDER SHORTENING TIME. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate.</i>		0	0.2	67.20	67.20	0.00	
444	H	2018	6	27	03019.01-B01	JJF	E-MAIL NOTICE TO GREGORY CREIGHTON REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW, NOTICE OF HEARING REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW, & ORDER SHORTENING TIME. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, no benefit to estate.</i>		0.2	100	20.00	20.00	0.00	
445	H	2018	6	27	03019.01-B01	JJF	PREPARE DECLARATION REGARDING EMAIL TO GREGORY CREIGHTON REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW, NOTICE OF HEARING REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW, & ORDER SHORTENING TIME. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate.</i>		0.3	100	30.00	30.00	0.00	
446	H	2018	6	29	03019.01-B01	DAT	REVIEW CLIENT LETTER REGARDING FEE DISPUTE. <i>Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate</i>		0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00	
447	H	2018	6	29	03019.01-T	DAT	E-MAIL FROM CLIENT WITH COPY OF SIGNED DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF CONFIRMATION BRIEF.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00	
448	H	2018	6	29	03019.01-T	DAT	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL TO FILE CONFIRMATION BRIEF.		0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00	

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
449	COST	2018	6	29	03019.01-T	MLM	COPIES OF CONFIRMATION BRIEF (232).			0	0.2	46.40	0.00	46.40
450	COST	2018	6	29	03019.01-T	MLM	POSTAGE FOR CONFIRMATION BRIEF.			0	0	17.00	0.00	17.00
451	H	2018	7	3	03019.01-B01	DAT	HEARING MOTION TO WITHDRAW. HEARING CONTINUED TO 7/11. Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate.			1.7	500	850.00	850.00	0.00
452	COST	2018	7	3	03019.01-B01	DAT	MILEAGE (30). Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate			0	0.56	16.80	16.80	0.00
453	COST	2018	7	3	03019.01-B01	DAT	PARKING. Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate			0	0	1.00	1.00	0.00
454	H	2018	7	5	03019.01-T	DAT	SET UP COURT CALL FOR CONFIRMATION HEARING ON 7/11. Ruling: Disallowed in part - task of setting up court call is clerical, nonattorney function, not billable at attorney rate. Allowed amount: 0.1 hour@\$100.00 hour.			0.1	500	50.00	40.00	10.00
455	COST	2018	7	9	03019.01-B01	MLM	MESSENGER SERVICE TO DELIVER JUDGE'S COPY TO LOS ANGELES COURTHOUSE.			0	0	39.60	0.00	39.60
456	H	2018	7	11	03019.01-B01	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING MOTION FOR LEAVE TO WITHDRAW. Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate			0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
457	H	2018	7	11	03019.01-B01	MLM	PREPARE ORDER GRANTING FIRM'S MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL OF RECORD. Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate			0.2	150	30.00	30.00	0.00
458	H	2018	7	11	03019.01-T	DAT	HEARING ON PLAN CONFIRMATION, MOTION TO WITHDRAW. Ruling: Disallowed in part - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate. Allowed time: 0.4 hour.			0.8	500	400.00	200.00	200.00
459	COST	2018	7	11	03019.01-T	DAT	COURTCALL FEE. INVOICE ID 9177052.			0	0	35.00	0.00	35.00
460	H	2018	7	11	03019.01-T	DAT	CONFER WITH PARALEGAL MURGUIA REGARDING PREPARATION OF DRAFT CONFIRMATION ORDER AND DRAFT ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW. Ruling: Disallowed in part - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate. Allowed time: 0.2 hour.			0.3	500	150.00	50.00	100.00
461	H	2018	7	11	03019.01-T	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE ORDER CONFIRMING PLAN.			0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
462	H	2018	7	11	03019.01-T	MLM	PREPARE ORDER CONFIRMING DEBTOR'S FIRST AMENDED PLAN OF REORGANIZATION.			0.2	150	30.00	0.00	30.00
463	H	2018	7	12	03019.01-B01	JJF	PREPARE NOTICE OF LODGMENT OF ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL. Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate.			0.3	100	30.00	30.00	0.00
464	COST	2018	7	12	03019.01-B01	JJF	COPIES OF NOTICE OF LODGMENT REGARDING MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL AND CONFIRMATION ORDER (20).			0	0.2	4.00	0.00	4.00
465	H	2018	7	12	03019.01-T	JJF	PREPARE NOTICE OF LODGMENT REGARDING CONFIRMATION ORDER.			0.3	100	30.00	0.00	30.00
466	H	2018	7	30	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE DAVID A. TILEM DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF FIRST AND FINAL APPLICATION.			0.4	500	200.00	0.00	200.00
467	H	2018	8	2	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND REVISE FINAL FEE APPLICATION.			0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
468	H	2018	8	10	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW E-MAIL FROM US TRUSTEE ATTORNEY YIP ABOUT FEE APPLICATION. Ruling: Allowed in full - fees for services rendered in preparation of fee application to clarify certain repetition services not part of fee application at request of US Trustee (per ECF 107).			0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
469	H			2018	8	10	03019.01-B02	DAT	E-MAIL TO U.S. TRUSTEE ATTORNEY YIP ABOUT FEE APPLICATION. Ruling: Allowed in full - fees for services rendered in preparation of fee application to clarify certain prepetition services not part of fee application at request of US Trustee (per ECF 107).	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
470	H			2018	8	10	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW EMAIL FROM DEBTOR - CONFIRM HEARING DATE WITH COURT CALENDAR AND TELEPHONE CALL TO CHAMBERS. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate, lack of necessity for attorney to perform clerical task (scheduling hearing).	0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00
471	H			2018	8	10	03019.01-B02	DAT	REPLY TO EMAIL FROM DEBTOR REGARDING FEE APPLICATION HEARING DATE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
472	H			2018	8	13	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY YIP REGARDING POSSIBLE STIPULATION TO RESOLVE FEE APPLICATION CONCERN. Ruling: Allowed in full - fees for services rendered in preparation of fee application to clarify certain prepetition services not part of fee application at request of US Trustee (per ECF 107).	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
473	H			2018	8	13	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM U.S. TRUSTEE ATTORNEY YIP AND PREPARE SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF FEE APPLICATION. Ruling: Allowed in full - fees for services rendered in preparation of fee application to clarify certain prepetition services not part of fee application at request of US Trustee (per ECF 107).	0.3	500	150.00	0.00	150.00
474	COST			2018	8	20	03019.01-B01	MLM	FEDERAL EXPRESS MOTION TO WITHDRAW AS COUNSEL OF RECORD. Ruling: Disallowed in full - task of withdrawal motion benefits applicant, not estate	0	0	203.03	203.03	0.00
475	H			2018	8	20	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM PETER KUDRAVE ABOUT HEARING ON FEE APPLICATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate	0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00
476	H			2018	8	21	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM PETER KUDRAVE WITH SETTLEMENT OFFER. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate	0.5	500	250.00	250.00	0.00
477	H			2018	8	23	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO EMAIL FROM FORMER CLIENT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
478	H			2018	8	23	03019.01-B02	DAT	CONFER WITH CRIMINAL COUNSEL TO EVALUATE WHETHER MR. KUDRAVE'S EMAIL IS EXTORTIONATE AND FOR ASSISTANCE IN DRAFTING A RESPONSE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate	0.3	500	150.00	150.00	0.00
479	H			2018	8	23	03019.01-B02	DAT	PREPARATION OF E-MAIL TO FORMER CLIENT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate	0.9	500	450.00	450.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
480	H			2018	8	27	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW COURT ORDER REGARDING FEE APPLICATION. CALENDAR SAME FOR NEW DATE/TIME. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
481	H			2018	9	13	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW REVISED FEE APPLICATION.	0.1	500	50.00	0.00	50.00
482	H			2018	9	20	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND SIGN AMENDED FEE APPLICATION DOCUMENTS.	0.2	500	100.00	0.00	100.00
483	C								FEDERAL EXPRESS FOR INVOICE 6-350-78526. Ruling: Disallowed in part - lack of demonstrated benefit to estate for express delivery of fee application. Allowed expenses for priority mail delivery: \$8.00	0	0	19.93	11.93	8.00
484	H			2018	10	15	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW FEE APPLICATION OPPOSITION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
485	H			2018	10	15	03019.01-B02	DAT	PREPARATION OF REPLY. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.2	500	600.00	600.00	0.00
486	H			2018	10	22	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW DEBTOR'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
487	H			2018	10	22	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW COURT'S TENTATIVE RULING FOR HEARING ON OCTOBER 24. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
488	H			2018	10	22	03019.01-B02	DAT	START TO REVIEW FILE AND TIMELINE RELATED TO COMPENSATION MOTION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.4	500	200.00	200.00	0.00
489	H			2018	10	22	03019.01-B02	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL TO ATTORNEY EXNOWSKI AND FOLLOW UP WITH EMAIL ABOUT POSSIBLE APPEARANCE AS WITNESS. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
490	H			2018	12	12	03019.01-B02	DAT	HEARING ON FEE APPLICATION - COURT SET TRIAL DATE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.8	500	400.00	400.00	0.00
491	N			2018	12	13	03019.01-B	DAT	TELEPHONE CALL FROM INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE REPRESENTATIVE. INFORMED HIM I AM NO LONGER COUNSEL OF RECORD. Ruling - Disallowed in full - applicant exercised billing judgment and indicated entry was "N" (no charge).	0.1	500	50.00	50.00	0.00
492	H			2018	12	19	03019.01-B02	DAT	CONFER WITH ATTORNEY LACEY TO LOCATE DOCUMENTS NEEDED FOR HIS REVIEW OF CASE TO ASSIST WITH TRIAL PREPARATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
493	H			2018	12	19	03019.01-B02	DAT	E-MAIL TO ATTORNEY KEVIN LACEY REGARDING PROPOSED DISCOVERY IN FEE DISPUTE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.3	500	150.00	150.00	0.00
494	H			2018	12	20	03019.01-B02	DAT	PREPARATION OF INTERROGATORIES AND START PREPARATION OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.1	500	550.00	550.00	0.00
495	H			2018	12	21	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW AND RESPOND TO E-MAIL FROM ATTORNEY LACEY REGARDING DISCOVERY. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.2	500	100.00	100.00	0.00
496	H			2018	12	21	03019.01-B02	DAT	PREPARATION OF DISCOVERY. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.9	500	450.00	450.00	0.00
497	H			2019	1	29	03019.01-B02	DAT	REVIEW FILE TO PREPARE FOR TRIAL TOMORROW. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	4.9	500	2,450.00	2,450.00	0.00
498	COST			2019	1	30	03019.01-B02	DAT	PARKING FOR HEARING ON 1/30/19. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0	0	9.00	9.00	0.00
499	COST			2019	1	30	03019.01-B02	DAT	MILEAGE TO HEARING ON 1/30/19 (20). Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0	0.56	11.20	11.20	0.00
500	H			2019	1	30	03019.01-B02	DAT	HEARING ON FEE APPLICATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	3.8	500	1,900.00	1,900.00	0.00
501	H			2019	1	30	03019.01-B02	DAT	DRAFT SETTLEMENT EMAIL TO PETER KUDRAVE. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.1	500	550.00	550.00	0.00
502	H			2019	1	30	03019.01-B02	DAT	START PREPARATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0.6	500	300.00	300.00	0.00
503	H			2019	1	31	03019.01-B02	DAT	START REVIEW OF BILLING RECORDS TO LOCATE THOSE SUBJECT TO OBJECTION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.2	500	600.00	600.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
504	H	2019	1	31	03019.01-B02	DAT			CAREFULLY DRAFT AND EDIT E-MAIL TO CLIENT REGARDING FEE DISPUTE, LITIGATION COSTS AND PROCESS, SETTLEMENT PROPOSALS AND NEWLY FILED COMPLAINT. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.8	500	900.00	900.00	0.00
505	COST	2019	1	31	03019.01-B02	DAT			AUDIO RECORDING OF HEARING. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	0	0	31.00	31.00	0.00
506	H	2019	2	8	03019.01-B02	DAT			CONTINUE PREPARATION OF POST-TRIAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF COMPENSATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.1	500	550.00	550.00	0.00
507	H	2019	2	19	03019.01-B02	DAT			REVIEW HEARING TAPE TO IDENTIFY COURT CONCERNS AND DEBTOR'S COMMENTS REGARDING FEE APPLICATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.9	500	950.00	950.00	0.00
508	H	2019	2	19	03019.01-B02	DAT			CONTINUE PREPARATION OF REPLY BRIEF TO AMENDED DECLARATION. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.7	500	850.00	850.00	0.00
509	H	2019	2	20	03019.01-B02	DAT			CONTINUE PREPARATION OF REPLY BRIEF. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	3.7	500	1,850.00	1,850.00	0.00
510	H	2019	2	20	03019.01-B02	DAT			CONTINUE PREPARATION OF REPLY BRIEF. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.4	500	700.00	700.00	0.00
511	H	2019	2	22	03019.01-B02	DAT			CONTINUE PREPARATION OF SECTION II OF SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY AND START REVIEW OF DEBTOR'S EXHIBITS. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	4.9	500	2,450.00	2,450.00	0.00
512	H	2019	2	22	03019.01-B02	DAT			CONTINUE PREPARATION OF SECTION II OF SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.2	500	600.00	600.00	0.00
513	H	2019	2	23	03019.01-B02	DAT			COMPLETE SECTION II OF FURTHER REPLY. PREPARE AND COMPLETE SECTION III OF FURTHER REPLY. START WORK ON SECTION IV OF FURTHER REPLY. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	2	500	1,000.00	1,000.00	0.00
514	H	2019	2	23	03019.01-B02	DAT			COMPLETE SECTIONS IV AND V TO REPLY BRIEF AND START WORK ON PREPARATION OF EXHIBITS AND FINAL FIGURES TO BE INSERTED. Ruling: Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.	1.2	500	600.00	600.00	0.00

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N
515	H								CALCULATE FINAL AMOUNT DUE, COMPLETE PREPARATION OF EXHIBITS TO SUPPLEMENTAL REPLY. <i>Ruling:</i> Disallowed in full - lack of necessity for task since attorney terminated representation, task benefits applicant as creditor, no benefit to estate for defense of fee application.					
516														
517	//	//	//		TOTALS	//			RULINGS SPREADSHEET TOTALS	//	//	82,488.55	40,970.36	41,518.19
518														
519	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				A - Services Not In Any Other Category (Ch. 11 General)	See ECF 138	//	10,293.03		
520	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				B - Firm Employment and Compensation	See ECF 138	//	566.55		
521	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				B01 - Motion to Withdraw	See ECF 138	//	3,060.83		
522	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				B02 - Final Fee Application Charges	See ECF 138	//	24,685.45		
523	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				B03 - Fee Application Mediation	See ECF 138	//	5,552.47		
524	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				C - U.S. Trustee Matters	See ECF 138	//	9,045.02		
525	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				F - Claims	See ECF 138	//	2,945.50		
526	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				G - Employment and Compensation of Other Professionals	See ECF 138	//	893.08		
527	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				M - Use, Sale or Lease of Estate Assets	See ECF 138	//	1,045.17		
528	//	//	//		ITEMIZED				T - Plan and Disclosure Statement Services	See ECF 138	//	31,828.24		
529	//													
530	//	//	//		TOTALS	//			TOTAL	See ECF 138	//	89,915.34		